arXiv:1107.4875v1 [math.CV] 25 Jul 2011

Proof of the BMV Conjecture

Herbert R Stahl

Abstract. We prove the BMV (Bessis, Moussa, Villani, [**1**]) conjecture, which states that the function $t \mapsto Tr\ \exp(A - tB)$, $t \geq 0$, is the Laplace transform of a positive measure on $[0, \infty)$ if A and B are $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices and B is positive semidefinite.

1. Introduction

1.1. The Conjecture.

Let A and B be two $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices and let B be positive semidefinite. In [**1**] it has been conjectured that under these assumptions the function

$$f(t) := Tr\, e^{A-tB}, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

can be represented as a Laplace transform

$$f(t) = \int e^{-t\,s} d\mu_{A,B}(s) \tag{1.2}$$

of a positive measure $\mu_{A,B}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$. In the present article we prove this conjecture from 1975 and give a semi-explicit expression for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ (cf., Theorem 1 and 2, below).

Over the years different approaches and techniques have been tested for proving the conjecture. Surveys are contained in [**15**] and [**7**]. Recent publications are typically concerned with techniques from non-communitative algebra and combinatorics ([**8**], [**10**], [**6**], [**9**], [**7**], [**11**], [**12**], [**2**], [**5**]). This direction of research has been opened by a reformulation of the conjecture in [**13**]. Although our approach will follow a different line of analysis, we nevertheless repeat the main assertions from [**13**] in the next as points of reference for discussions.

1.2. Reformulations of the Conjecture.

Definition 1. *A function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is called completely monotonic if*

$$(-1)^m f^{(m)}(t) \geq 0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad m \in \mathbb{N} \quad \textit{and} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

By Bernstein's theorem about completely monotonic functions (cf., [**3**] or [**19**, Chapter IV]) this property is equivalent to the existence of the Laplace transform (1.2) with a positive measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$. In this way, Definition 1 gives a first reformulation of the BMV conjecture.

In [**13**] two other reformulations have been proved. It has been shown that the conjecture is equivalent to each of the following two assertions:

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 15A15, 15A16; Secondary 30F10, 44A10.

Key words and phrases. BMV conjecture, Laplace transform, special matrix functions.

The research has been supported by the grant STA 299/13-1 der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

(i) Let A and B be two positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the polynomial $t \mapsto Tr(A+tB)^m$ has only non-negative coefficients.

(ii) Let A be a positive definite and B a positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix. For each $p > 0$ the function $t \mapsto Tr(A+tB)^{-p}$ is the Laplace transform of a positive measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$.

Especially, reformulation (i) has paved the way for extensive research activities with tools from non-commutative algebra, several of the papers have been mentioned earlier. The parameter m in assertion (i) brings in a new and discrete gradation to the problem. Presently, assertion (i) has been proved for $m \leq 13$ (cf., [**9**], [**11**]). The BMV-conjecture itself is apparently still unproven, even for the general case of matrices with a dimension as low as $n = 3$.

In [**13**] one also finds a short review of the relevance of the BMV conjecture in mathematical physics, the area from which the problem has arisen originally.

Among the earlier investigations of the conjecture, especially [**14**] has been very impressive and fascinating for the author. There, already in 1976, the conjecture has been proved for a rather broad class of matrices, including the two groups of examples with explicit solutions that we will state next.

1.3. Two Groups of Examples with Explicit Solutions.

1.3.1. *Commuting Matrices A and B.* If the two matrices A and B commute, then they can be diagonalized simultaneously, and consequently the BMV conjecture becomes solvable rather easily; the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2) is then given by

$$\mu_{A,B} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_j}\, \delta_{b_j} \tag{1.3}$$

with $a_1, \dots, a_n$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n$ the eigenvalues of the two matrices A and B, respectively, and δ_x the Dirac measure at the point x. Indeed, the trace of a matrix M is invariant under similarity transformations $M \mapsto T\,M\,T^{-1}$. Therefore, we can assume without loss of generality that A and B are given in diagonal form, and measure (1.3) follows immediately.

1.3.2. *Matrices of Dimension $n = 2$.* We consider 2×2 Hermitian matrices A and B with B being assumed to be positive semidefinite. In order to keep notations simple, we assume B to be given in diagonal form $B = \operatorname{diag}(b_1, b_2)$ with $0 \leq b_1 \leq b_2$, which can be done without loss of generality.

If $b_1 = b_2$, then, without loss of generality, also the matrix A can be assumed to be given in diagonal form, and the case is therefore covered by (1.3). Consequently, we have to consider only the situation that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ \overline{a}_{12} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & 0 \\ 0 & b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq b_1 < b_2 < \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

Proposition 1. *If the matrices A and B are given by (1.4), then the function $t \mapsto Tr\exp(A - tB)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, in (1.1) can be represented as a Laplace transform (1.3) with the positive measure*

$$d\mu_{A,B}(t) = e^{a_{11}} d\delta_{b_1}(t) + e^{a_{22}} d\delta_{b_2}(t) + w_{A,B}(t)\chi_{(b_1,b_2)}(t)dt, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\chi_{(b_1,b_2)}$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval (b_1, b_2), and the density function $w_{A,B}$ is given by

$$w_{A,B}(t) = \frac{4}{(b_2 - b_1)\,\pi} \exp\left(\frac{a_{11}(b_2 - t) + a_{22}(t - b_1)}{b_2 - b_1}\right) \times \tag{1.6}$$

$$\times \int_0^{|a_{12}|} \cos\left(\frac{b_2 + b_1 - 2\,t}{b_2 - b_1}\, u\right) \sinh\left(\sqrt{|a_{12}|^2 - u^2}\right) du$$

for $b_1 < t < b_2$*. This density function is positive for all* $b_1 < t < b_2$*.*

Proposition 1 will be proved in Section 7, further below. Also in [**14**], an explicit solution has been given for dimension $n = 2$, but there the density function looks rather different from (1.6). However, it has the advantage that its positivity can be recognized immediately, while in case of (1.6) a nontrivial proof of positivity is required (cf., Subsection 7.2).

1.4. The Main Result.

We shall prove two theorems. In the first one it is practically only proved that the BMV-conjecture is true, while in the second one we give a semi-explicit representation for the positive measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in the Laplace transform (1.3). In many respects this second theorem is a generalization of Proposition 1.

Theorem 1. *If* A *and* B *are two Hermitian matrices with* B *being positive semi-definite, then there uniquely exists a positive measure* $\mu_{A,B}$ *on* $[0,\infty)$ *such that (1.3) holds for* $t \geq 0$*. In other words: the BMV-conjecture holds true.*

For the formulation of the second theorem we need some preparations.

Lemma 1. *Let* A *and* B *be the two matrices from Theorem 1. Then there exists an unitary matrix* T_0 *such that the transformed matrices* $\widetilde{A} = (\widetilde{a}_{ij}) := T_0^* A T_0$ *and* $\widetilde{B} := T_0^* B T_0$ *satisfy*

$$\widetilde{B} = \operatorname{diag}\left(\widetilde{b}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{b}_n\right) \quad \textit{with} \quad 0 \leq \widetilde{b}_1 \leq \ldots \leq \widetilde{b}_n, \tag{1.7}$$

and

$$\widetilde{a}_{ij} = 0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, n, i \neq j \quad \textit{with} \quad \widetilde{b}_i = \widetilde{b}_j. \tag{1.8}$$

Proof. The existence of an unitary matrix T_0 such that (1.7) holds is guaranteed by the assumption that B is Hermitian. If all $\widetilde{b}_j$ are pair-wise different, then requirement (1.8) is void. If however several $\widetilde{b}_j$ are identical, then one can rotate the corresponding subspaces in such a way that besides of (1.7) also (1.8) is satisfied. □

Since the matrix $A - tB$ is Hermitian for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists an unitary matrix $T_1 = T_1(t)$ such that

$$T_1^* (A - t\,B) T_1 = \operatorname{diag}\left(\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t)\right). \tag{1.9}$$

The n functions $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ in (1.9) are restrictions to $\mathbb{R}_+$ of branches of the solution λ of the polynomial equation

$$g(\lambda, t) := \det\left(\lambda\, I - (A - t\, B)\right) = 0, \tag{1.10}$$

i.e., λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is a branch of the solution λ if the pair $(\lambda, t) = (\lambda_j(t), t)$ satisfies (1.10) for each $t \in \mathbb{C}$. The solution λ is an algebraic function of degree n if the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ is irreducible, and it consists of several algebraic functions otherwise. In the most extreme situation, the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ can be factorized in n linear factors, and this is exactly the case when the two matrices A and B commute, as it has been discussed in Subsection 1.3.1.

In any case, the solution λ of (1.10) a multivalued function over $\mathbb{C}$, and the total number of different branches λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is always exactly n. In the next lemma, properties of the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are assembled, which are relevant for the formulation of Theorem 2. The lemma will be proved in a wider context as a special case of Lemma 6 in Section 3.

Lemma 2. *There exist n different branches* λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, *of the solution* λ *of (1.10). Each one can be assumed to be analytic in a punctured neighborhood of infinity, none of them has a branch point at infinity, and they can be numbered in such a way that we have*

$$\lambda_j(t) = \widetilde{a}_{jj} - \widetilde{b}_j t + O(1/t) \quad as \quad t \to \infty, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \tag{1.11}$$

where the coefficients $\widetilde{a}_{jj}, \widetilde{b}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, *are elements from the matrices* $\widetilde{A}$ *and* $\widetilde{B}$ *introduced in Lemma 1.*

With Lemma 1 and 2 we are ready to formulate the second theorem.

Theorem 2. *For the measure* $\mu_{A,B}$ *in (1.3) we have the representation*

$$d\mu_{A,B}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\widetilde{a}_{jj}} d\delta_{\widetilde{b}_j}(t) + w_{A,B}(t)dt, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{1.12}$$

with a density function $w_{A,B}$ *that can be represented as*

$$w_{A,B}(t) = \sum_{\widetilde{b}_j < t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\zeta} d\zeta, \quad for \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{1.13}$$

or equivalently as

$$w_{A,B}(t) = -\sum_{\widetilde{b}_j > t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\zeta} d\zeta, \quad for \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{1.14}$$

where each integration path C_j *is a positively oriented, rectifiable Jordan curve in* $\mathbb{C}$ *with the property that the responding function* λ_j *is analytic on and outside of* C_j. *The values* $\widetilde{a}_{jj}$, $\widetilde{b}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, *have been introduced in Lemma 1, and the functions* λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, *in Lemma 2.*

The measure $\mu_{A,B}$ *is positive, of bounded variation, and we have*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{A,B}) \subseteq [\widetilde{b}_1, \widetilde{b}_n]. \tag{1.15}$$

Obviously, the non-negativity of the density function $w_{A,B}$ is not evident prima vista from representation (1.13) or (1.14). The proof of the non-negativity of $w_{A,B}$ will be the main topic of Section 6.

The semi-explicit representation of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in Theorem 2 is decisive for the strategy for our proof of the BMV conjecture, but it probably possesses also independent value. In any case, it already conveys some ideas about the nature of the solution, and its structure gives also hints with respect to the analysis used in the proof.

1.5. Outline of the Proofs.

Theorem 1 and 2 will be proved in parallel, and the preparation of this proof will fill the greater part of the remainder of the paper, only the last section is reserved for a proof of Proposition 1. Since the general structure of the approach may easily get lost in technical details, we will give an overview over the specific aims at the different stages in the present somewhat extended outline.

1.5.1. *Section 2: Technical Assumptions.* In Section 2 we introduce two technical assumptions that will simplify the analysis at many places, and they will be effective until Section 6, i.e., they will be effective throughout the whole analysis that is needed for the proof of Theorem 1 and 2. In the first one (Assumption 1 in Section 2) it is assumed that the matrices A and B are already given in the form that is derived in (1.7) and (1.8) of Lemma 1 by a similarity transformation. In the second one (Assumption 2 in Section 2) it is assumed that the matrix B is positive definite. Both assumptions do not limit the generality of the proof of Theorem 1 and 2 (cf., Lemma 3 in Section 2).

1.5.2. *Section 3: Integral Representations.* In Section 3 the solution λ of the polynomial equation (1.10) and the solution τ of another polynomial equation will be studied with the aim to collect enough knowledge so that at the end of the section a simple-structured integral representation for the function f from (1.1) and, most importantly, also for its higher derivatives $f^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, can be derived.

The solution λ of (1.10) is a multivalued function defined over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. If the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ in (1.10) is irreducible, then λ is an algebraic function of order n. Otherwise, it consists of several algebraic functions, and the total order of these functions is again n. In each case, λ possesses exactly n branches λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, which can be chosen in such a way that the properties listed in Lemma 2 are satisfied. Since Assumption 1 from Section 2 will be effective in Sections 3 through 6, we have

$$\widetilde{a}_{jj} = a_{jj} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{b}_j = b_j \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1.16}$$

and relation (1.11) in Lemma 2 will take the form

$$\lambda_j(t) = a_{jj} - b_j t + \mathrm{O}\,(1/t) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \ldots, n \tag{1.17}$$

(cf., Lemma 4, 5, and 6 in Section 3).

For each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the values $\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t)$ are the n eigenvalues of the Hermitian matrix $A - t\,B$, and as a consequence we shall get the representation

$$f(t) = Tr\, e^{A-tB} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\lambda_j(t)}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{1.18}$$

for the function f from (1.1), and (1.18) will be extended to all $t \in \mathbb{C}$ (cf., Lemma 9 in Section 3).

From (1.18) we shall then derive the representation

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta - \lambda_j(t)} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \tag{1.19}$$

with Γ being a Hankel contour $\mathbb{C} \diagdown \mathbb{R}_-$ that satisfies the two conditions

(a): $\lambda_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma)$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$,

(b): λ_j is analytic in $\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma)$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

(cf., Lemma 13 in Section 3, and Definition 4 for a description of Hankel contours). It is always possible to find such a Hankel contour Γ since each function λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is assumed to be analytic in a puncture neighborhood of infinity.

In the course of our analysis in Section 5, we shall use the Koch-Widder inversion formula for Laplace transforms, and this tool requires a representation of the derivatives $f^{(k)}$ for arbitrary large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Derivatives of (1.19) become too complicated to be useful for large k. In order to overcome this conceptual weakness of representation (1.19), we shall, in addition to equation (1.10), consider the polynomial equation

$$\widehat{g}(\tau, z) := \det\Big(\tau\, I - (\widetilde{A} - z\, \widetilde{B})\Big) = 0 \tag{1.20}$$

with $\widehat{A} := B^{-1/2} A\, B^{-1/2}$ and $\widehat{B} := B^{-1}$, and derive an alternative representation for f. The two new matrices share all relevant properties of the matrices A and B. For instance, both are Hermitian, and the Assumptions 1 and 2 from Section 2 are satisfied if they are satisfied by the original matrices A and B.

Like the solution λ of equation (1.10), so also the solution τ of equation (1.20) is a multivalued functions with n branches τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. These branches can be chosen to be analytic in a punctured neighborhood of infinity, and at infinity we have

$$\tau_j(z) = \frac{a_{jj}}{b_j} - \frac{1}{b_j} z + \mathrm{O}\left(1/z\right) \quad \text{as} \quad z \to \infty \tag{1.21}$$

as an analogue to (1.17) (cf., Lemma 11 in Section 3). Moreover, there exist two open neighborhoods $U_\lambda, U_\tau \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of infinity in which the inverse relations

$$\lambda_j(t) = \tau_j^{-1}(t) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in U_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_j(z) = \lambda_j^{-1}(z) \quad \text{for} \quad z \in U_\tau \tag{1.22}$$

hold true (cf., Lemma 12 in Section 3). With the n functions τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, we shall then derive representation

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\tau_j'(\zeta) d\zeta}{\tau_j(\zeta) - t} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where again Γ is an appropriately chosen Hankel contour (cf., Lemma 13 in Section 3). In contrast to representation (1.19), we now have a rather transparent dependence on t, and thanks to that we shall get a nice and manageable representation for $f^{(k)}$. We shall prove that

$$f^{(k)}(t) = \frac{(k-1)!}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{d\zeta}{(\tau_j(\zeta) - t)^k} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad \text{and} \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{1.23}$$

(cf., Lemma 14 in Section 3). The integration part Γ in (1.23) has to be a Hankel contour that satisfies

(a'): $\tau_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma)$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$,
(b'): τ_j is analytic in $\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma)$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

(cf., Lemma 14 in Section 3). With the derivation of formula (1.23) the main aim of the analysis in Section 3 will be accomplished.

1.5.3. *Section 4: Asymptotic Approximations.* The principal aim of the analysis in Section 4 will be to prove the asymptotic approximation

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(k)}\left(\frac{k}{t}\right) \;=\; \Big((-1)^k + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\Big)\; k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^k \Bigg[& \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\, 2\pi}} \sum_{j=1}^n e^{a_{jj}}\, \psi\left(\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^k - \\ & - \frac{t}{k} \sum_{t < b_j} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \Bigg] \quad \text{as } k \to \infty \quad \text{and} \quad t > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.24}$$

with an error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})$ that holds uniformly for all $t > 0$ (cf., Proposition 2 in Section 4). By ψ we denote the function $\psi(z) := z e^{1-z}$, by λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, the n branches of the solution λ of equation (1.10) with the properties listed in Lemma 2 (see also Definition 2 in Section 3), and by C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, positively oriented Jordan curves chosen in such a way that in each case the corresponding function λ_j is analytic on and in the exterior of C_j.

In Section 5, estimate (1.24) will be a key ingredient in the Koch-Widder inversion formula for Laplace transforms, which then leads to a proof of the representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$. The expression in the first line of (1.24) will lead to the discrete component of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$, and the expression in the second line to the continuous one.

The proof of (1.24) will start from (1.23), which yields

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) \;=\; (-1)^k (k-1)! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^k \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^{\zeta} \frac{d\zeta}{(1-\frac{t}{k}\tau_j(\zeta))^k} \tag{1.25}$$

with τ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, the n branches of the solution τ of equation (1.20) (cf., Definition 3 in Section 3), and Γ a Hankel contour with properties as stated after (1.23).

Next, we shall apply the variable substitution

$$\zeta = k\frac{b_j}{t}\,z \,+\, a_{jj}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

in the n integrals in (1.25), which leads to

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = (-1)^k (k-1)! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j e^{a_{jj}}\, I_{1,k}(j,t) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty \tag{1.26}$$

with $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ an abbreviation for the integral

$$I_{1,k}(j,t) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\,dz}{(1-\frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}\,z\,+\,a_{jj}))^k} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\,dz}{(1+z+\frac{t^2}{z}\mathrm{O}(k^{-2}))^k}, \tag{1.27}$$

$j = 1, \dots, n$, $t > 0$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The second equality in (1.27) follows from (1.21), and the error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-2})$ in (1.27) holds for $k \to \infty$. More details will be given in Section 3 since the asymptotic approximation of $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ for $k \to \infty$ will be the core piece of the proof of (1.24), and it will demand most of the work in Section 3. It will be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,k}(j,t) \;=\; \Big(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\Big)\, \Big[&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\,k}}\frac{t}{b_j}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k - \\ &- \chi_{(0.b_j)}(t)\frac{t^2}{k\,b_j}e^{-a_{jj}}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta \Big] \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{1.28}$$

with $j = 1, \dots, n$ and an error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})$ that holds uniformly for $t > 0$ (cf., Lemma 21 in Section 4). The objects λ_j, C_j, and ψ in (1.28) are the same as in (1.24). When (1.28) will be proved, then (1.24) follows rather immediately from (1.28) together with (1.26).

The proof of (1.28) is very technical, and our discussion in the present preview is limited to the basic ideas in a slightly simplified setup. We consider only the two cases

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Case (i):} && t \,>\, b_j, \\ &\text{Case (ii):} && 0 \,<\, t \,<\, b_j \end{aligned} \tag{1.29}$$

with j a fixed element of $\{\,1, \dots, n\,\}$.

Case (i): The integral

$$I_{0,k}(j,t) \;:=\; \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z} \frac{dz}{(z+1)^k} \quad \text{for} \quad k \to \infty,\; j = 1, \dots, n, \tag{1.30}$$

is a simplified version of $I_{1,k}(j,t)$, and in Section 4 it will be analyzed as a model problem for the approximation of $I_{1,k}(j,t)$. With the saddle point method and Sterling's formula it follows that

$$I_{0,k}(j,t) \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\,k}}\frac{t}{b_j}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k \left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty \tag{1.31}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $t > 0$ (cf., Lemma 17 in Section 4). In the saddle point method we have used the path of steepest descent with respect to the modulus of the integrand in $I_{0,k}(j,t)$. This path is given by

$$\Gamma_{0,j}: \quad z(u) := \frac{t}{b_j}\, u \cot u - 1 + i\,\frac{t}{b_j}\, u, \quad u \in (-\pi, \pi) \tag{1.32}$$

(cf., (4.24) and Lemma 18 in Section 4), and the integrand in (1.30) possesses only one single saddle point at

$$x_{0,j} = \frac{t}{b_j} - 1 \tag{1.33}$$

(cf., (4.23)). Both integrals $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ and $I_{0,k}(j,t)$ will be compared along the integration path $\Gamma_{0,j}$.

Because of the assumption $t > b_j$, we have $x_{0,j} > 0$, and therefore we can deduce from (1.32) that the transformed function $\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}(\,\cdot\,) + a_{jj})$ is analytic in $\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_{0,j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and k sufficiently large, which implies that $\Gamma_{0,j}$ is an admissible integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ from (1.27) (cf., the first paragraph in Case (a) in Subsection 4.4). Uniformly for $z \in \Gamma_{0,j}$ we have

$$\left(\frac{1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}\, z \,+\, a_{jj})}{1+z}\right)^{-k} = \left(\frac{1 + z + \frac{t^2}{z}\mathrm{O}(k^{-2})}{1+z}\right)^{-k} = 1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1}) \tag{1.34}$$

as $k \to \infty$ (cf., Lemma 16 and assertion (iii) of Lemma 22 in Section 4), which will imply that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,k}(j,t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{0,j}} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\, dz}{(1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}\, z \,+\, a_{jj}))^k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{0,j}} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}}{(1+z)^k}\left(\frac{1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}\, z \,+\, a_{jj})}{1+z}\right)^{-k} dz \\ &= I_{0,k}(j,t)\,\left(1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{1.35}$$

(cf., (4.54) in Section 4), and estimate (1.28) follows from (1.35) and (1.31) for any fixed $t > b_j$ with an error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})$, which concludes our discussion of case (i).

We add that in Section 4 the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ itself will not be approximated by the saddle point method. This method will only be applied to the integral $I_{0,k}(j,t)$, and estimate (1.35) will then follow from a comparison of both integrals along the path $\Gamma_{0,j}$. An application of the saddle point method directly to the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ would be rather complicated and perhaps a hopeless undertaking.

Case (ii): The condition $0 < t < b_j$ implies that $x_{0,j} < 0$, and consequently, in this case, the origin lies in the exterior of $\Gamma_{0,j}$ (cf., Lemma 18 in Section 4), which implies that $\Gamma_{0,j}$ is no longer admissible as an integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ from (1.27). Indeed, all branch points of the expression $1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}(\,\cdot\,) + a_{jj})$ cluster at the origin as $k \to \infty$, and any admissible integration path Γ has therefore to encircle the origin. Such a path is given by

$$\Gamma_{1,j} := \Gamma_{0,j} \cup C_{0,j}$$

if k is sufficiently large, $\Gamma_{0,j}$ the Hankel contour from (1.32), and $C_{0,j}$ a small, positively oriented circle around the origin that is fully contained in the exterior of $\Gamma_{0,j}$. With the path $\Gamma_{1,j}$ we shall introduce the two integrals $I_{2,k}(j,t)$ and $I_{3,k}(j,t)$

by

$$I_{1,k}(j,t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{1,j}} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\,dz}{(1-\frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}\,z\,+\,a_{jj}))^k} \tag{1.36}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left[\int_{\Gamma_{0,j}}\cdots\,+\,\oint_{C_{0,j}}\cdots\right] =: I_{2,k}(j,t)\,+\,I_{3,k}(j,t).$$

For the integral $I_{2,k}(j,t)$ we shall get an identical type of approximation along $\Gamma_{0,j}$ as it has been discussed before in case (i). Analogously to (1.35), we then have

$$I_{2,k}(j,t) = I_{0,k}(j,t)\,\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty. \tag{1.37}$$

For the integral $I_{3,k}(j,t)$, on the other hand, one will get the approximation

$$I_{3,k}(j,t) = \frac{1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i}\frac{t\,e^{-a_{jj}}}{k\,b_j}\oint\limits_{|\zeta|=R} e^{\zeta+t\,\tau_j(\zeta)}\,d\zeta \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty$$

after several transformations (cf., the analysis from (4.61) through (4.62) in Section 4), and by a further transformation, in which we shall use the inverse relations (1.22) between λ_j and τ_j, $j=1,\dots,n$, we shall get the asymptotic approximation

$$I_{3,k}(j,t) = \frac{-1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i}\frac{t^2}{k\,b_j}e^{-a_{jj}}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(u)+t\,u}du \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty. \tag{1.38}$$

(cf., formula (4.63) in Section 4).

After these preparations, estimate (1.28) will follow from (1.37) and (1.38) together with (1.36) and (1.31) for $0<t<b_j$ fixed, which concludes our discussion of case (ii).

The sketch of a proof of (1.28) guarantees only point-wise error estimates. In order to get uniformity with respect to $t>0$, a more refined strategy will be followed in Section 4. For instance, in a neighborhood of $t=b_j$, two additional subcases will be studied (cf., (4.52) in Section 4). Because of the more refined strategy, it will, however, only be possible to prove an error estimate of order $k^{-1/4}$, instead of k^{-1}, as it has been done in (1.35), (1.37), and (1.38) for our pointwise approach. The necessary refinements of the analysis are the cause for the rather technical character of several lemmas and proofs in Section 4.

1.5.4. *Section 5: Inversion of the Laplace Transform.* In Section 5 we shall prove the representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ with the help of the Post-Widder inversion formula for Laplace transforms, which is a tool for recovering a function φ or a measure μ from their Laplace transform $\mathcal{L}(\varphi)$ or $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$, respectively, (cf. [**16**], [**18**], [**19**, Chapter VII]). This technique is perhaps best known for the special case of a Laplace transform $F=\mathcal{L}(\varphi)$ of a piecewise continues, integrable function φ on $\mathbb{R}_+$. In this case it states that

$$\varphi(t) \,=\, \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{(-1)^k}{k!}\left(\frac{k}{t}\right)^{k+1} F^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) \tag{1.39}$$

for each $t>0$ where φ is continuous (cf., Proposition 3 in Section 5, where, however, we have given a slightly more general formulation, in which φ is only assumed to be integrable and not piecewise continuous).

For the proof of the representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 we shall need a more general version of the Post-Widder inversion formula than that given in (1.39). In our situation, the formula has to cover the case of a Laplace transform $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$ of an arbitrary measure μ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ of bounded variation (cf., Theorem 4 in Section 5). Further, we will also addresse the problem of existence of such a measure (cf., Theorem 3 in Section 5). For the convenience of the reader we shall assemble in Subsection 5.1 all results connected with the Post-Widder inversion formula that will be needed in the subsequent analysis. As general reference we use the book [**19**] by David V. Widder.

The asymptotic approximation (1.24) of the expression $f^{(k)}(k/t)$ for $k \to \infty$ of the function f from (1.1) will be the starting point for the proof of the representations (1.12) through (1.14). In Subsection 5.3 it will then be shown that the expression in the first line of (1.24) leads to the discrete component of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ (cf., Lemma 23 in Section 5), and the expression in the second line leads to the representations (1.13) and (1.14) of the density function $w_{A,B}$ in the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ (cf., Lemma 25 in Section 5).

While the positivity of the discrete component of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ is immediately obvious from representation (1.12), the non-negativity of the density function demands a nontrivial proof that will be given in Section 6.

In Section 5 we shall also prove the existence of a measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2). Such a proof is not really necessary since existence has already been proved in [**14**], and the argumentation from there has been repeated in [**15**]. However, the whole approach in both publications is rather different from that in the present paper, and since most of the analysis that is needed for a proof of existence along the lines of the Post-Widder inversion formula has to be done anyhow, we will, in Subsection 5.2, include a new proof for the sake of completeness and a methodological homogeneity of our investigations.

1.5.5. *Section 6: Proof of Positivity.*

In Section 6 we shall, at last, prove that the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ is positive. The representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 will play a key role in this proof. The positivity of the discrete component

$$d\mu_d := \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\widetilde{a}_{jj}} \delta_{\widetilde{b}_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_{jj}} d\delta_{b_j} \tag{1.40}$$

of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ is obvious. Consequently, the essential part of a proof of positivity will be to show that the density function $w_{A,B}$ in (1.13) is non-negative.

In a first step, the non-negativity of $w_{A,B}$ will be proved under the additional assumption that the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ in (1.10) is irreducible (cf., Assumption 3 in Subsection 6.1). Later in Subsection 6.4, it will be shown that this additional assumption can be made superfluous.

In the preview of Section 3, it has already been mentioned that if $g(\lambda, t)$ is irreducible, then the solution λ of equation (1.10) is an algebraic function of degree n with the compact Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ as its natural domain of definition and canonical projection $\pi_\lambda : \mathcal{R}_\lambda \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$. It also has been mentioned there before (1.17) that the n branches λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, of λ can be assumed to be analytic in a punctured neighborhood of infinity. Because of this last assumption, it is possible to assume that in representation (1.13) of $w_{A,B}$ all integration paths C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, can be chosen to be identical, i.e., we have $C_j = C$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ with $C \subset \mathbb{C}$ a smooth Jordan curve that contains all singularities of the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, in its interior. By $\widetilde{C}_j \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, we denote the n components of the lifting $\pi_\lambda^{-1}(C)$ of the curve of C onto $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, which indeed consists of n disjoint, oriented Jordan curves (cf., the proof of Proposition 6 in Subsection 6.3).

A main element of the proof of positivity will be to show that for each $t \in (b_I, b_{I+1})$ with $I \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, there exists a chain $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_K$ of finitely many closed, piece-wise analytic integration paths on $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ such that

$$\operatorname{Im} e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \zeta \in \gamma \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda, \tag{1.41}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{\gamma} e^{\lambda(\zeta)+t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)}d\zeta \,<\, 0, \quad \text{and} \tag{1.42}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{\gamma+\widetilde{C}_1+\cdots+\widetilde{C}_I} e^{\lambda(\zeta)+t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)}d\zeta \,=\, 0 \tag{1.43}$$

(cf., Proposition 6 in Section 6). It is obvious that relation (1.41) determines the properties of the curves in the chain γ (cf., Lemma 26 in Section 6). The proof of inequality (1.42) will be based on properties of the harmonic functions $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda+t\,\pi_\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda+t\,\pi_\lambda)$ on γ (cf., Lemma 27 in Section 6), and identity (1.43) is a consequence of the fact that the chain $\gamma+\widetilde{C}_1+\cdots+\widetilde{C}_I$ is the positively oriented contour ∂D_0 of an open set $D_0\subset\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ in which all λ_j, $j=1,\ldots,n$, are analytic (cf., the argumentation after (6.18)). Since we have

$$\lambda(\zeta) \,=\, \lambda_j(\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta\in\widetilde{C}_j,\ \ j=1,\ldots,n,$$

we deduce for each $t\in(b_I,b_{I+1})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{b_j<t}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta &= \sum_{j=1}^{I}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{\widetilde{C}_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{\widetilde{C}_1+\cdots+\widetilde{C}_I} e^{\lambda(\zeta)+t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)}d\zeta.\end{aligned} \tag{1.44}$$

With (1.42), (1.43), (1.44), and representation (1.13) in Theorem 2, we will then have proved that

$$w_{A,B}(t) \,>\, 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad t\in[b_1,b_n]\diagdown\{b_1,\ldots,b_n\}. \tag{1.45}$$

(cf., the argumentation in the Proof of Theorem 1 and 2 under Assumption 3, in Subsection 6.3). With (1.45) we will have complete the proof of positivity of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ under the additional Assumption 3 from Subsection 6.1.

In Subsection 6.3, it will also be shown that Assumption 3 from Subsection 6.1 implies that instead of (1.15) in Theorem 2 we have the likely stronger relation

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu_{A,B}) = [b_1,b_n] = [\widetilde{b}_1,\widetilde{b}_n]$$

(cf., Lemma 28 in Section 6), which will not hold true in general.

So far, all considerations have been done under the additional assumption that the polynomial $g(\lambda,t)$ in (1.10) is irreducible. In Subsection 6.4, the proof of positivity will then be extended to the general situation by using the fact that without the assumption of irreducibility, the solution λ of equation (1.10) consists of several algebraic functions $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l=1,\ldots,m$, and the analysis for a single algebraic function λ can be carried over to the individual functions $\lambda_{(l)}$ (cf., Subsection 6.4).

With the analysis in Subsection 6.4, the proof of Theorem 1 and 2, and thereby also the proof of the BMV conjecture will finally be completed.

1.5.6. *Section 7: Proof of Proposition 1.* In the last section we shall prove Proposition 1, which is a special case of Theorem 1 and 2 for $n=2$. However, representation (1.6) for the density function $w_{A,B}$ is much more explicit than the representations (1.13) and (1.14) in Theorem 2, and the difference requires a proof. In Subsection 7.3 we shall also compare representation (1.6) in Proposition 1 with a corresponding result in [**14**].

2. Technical Assumptions

We make the following two technical assumptions that are assumed to be satisfied throughout all steps of the proof of Theorem 1 and 2.

Assumption 1. *It is assumed in Section 3 through 6 that*

$$B = \operatorname{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_n) \quad \text{with} \quad 0 \le b_1 \le \dots \le b_n < \infty, \quad \text{and} \tag{2.1}$$

$$a_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, i \ne j \quad \text{with} \quad b_i = b_j, \tag{2.2}$$

i.e., the matrices A and B are assumed to be given in the form (1.7) and (1.8) of Lemma 1.

Assumption 2. *It is assumed in Section 3 through 6 that*

$$0 < b_1 \le \dots \le b_n, \tag{2.3}$$

i.e., the matrix B is assumed to be positive definite.

Lemma 3. *The Assumptions 1 and 2 do not limit the generality of the proof of Theorem 1 and 2.*

Proof. In Lemma 1 it has been shown that there exists a similarity transformations $M \mapsto T_0^* M T_0$ with T_0 an unitary matrix such that any given pair of matrices A and B, which satisfies the assumptions of the BMV conjecture, is transformed into matrices $\widetilde{A}$ and $\widetilde{B}$ that have the special form of (2.1) and (2.2). Since the trace of a matrix is invariant under such similarity transformations, we have

$$f(t) = Tr\, e^{A-tB} = Tr\, T_0^* e^{A-tB} T_0 = Tr\, e^{T_0^* A T_0 - t\, T_0^* B T_0}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, which shows that the function f in (1.1) remains invariant under this transformation, and therefore Assumption 1 does not limit the generality of a proof of Theorem 1 and 2.

If in $B = \operatorname{diag}(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ we have $b_1 = 0$, then the matrix $\widetilde{B} := B + \varepsilon I = \operatorname{diag}\left(\widetilde{b}_1, \dots, \widetilde{b}_n\right)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfies Assumption 2. We have $\widetilde{b}_j = b_j + \varepsilon$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and it follows from (1.1) that

$$\widetilde{f}(t) := Tr\, e^{A-t\widetilde{B}} = e^{-\varepsilon t} Tr\, e^{A-tB} = e^{-\varepsilon t} f(t) \quad \text{for} \quad t \ge 0. \tag{2.4}$$

From (2.4) and the translation property of Laplace transforms, we deduce that the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2) for the function f is the image of the measure $\mu_{A,\widetilde{B}}$ for the function $\widetilde{f}$ under the translation $t \mapsto t - \varepsilon$. From (1.15) in Theorem 2 it then follows that $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{A,B}) \subseteq [b_1, b_n] \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$, and consequently the proof of Theorem 1 and 2 for the matrices A and $\widetilde{B}$ carries over to the situation with the original matrices A and B. □

3. Integral Representations

In the present section we study the solution of the polynomial equation (1.10), and in addition also the solution of a second equation, which will be introduced in Subsection 3.3. The Assumptions 1 and 2 from the last section are taken to be satisfied throughout the present and also throughout the next three sections. The main aim of the analysis in the present section is an integral representation for the function f from (1.1), and more importantly also for its derivatives $f^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. As a secondary aim we shall clarify the implications in case of a polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ in (1.10) which is not irreducible.

3.1. The Functions $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$. The solution λ of the polynomial equation (1.10) is a multivalued function with n branches λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, defined in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Each pair $(\lambda, t) = (\lambda_j(t), t)$ with $t \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ satisfies the equation

$$0 \,=\, g(\lambda, t) \,:=\, \det\left(\lambda I - (A - t\,B)\right) \,=\, g_{(1)}(\lambda, t) \cdots g_{(m)}(\lambda, t), \tag{3.1}$$

which is an identical repetition of (1.10), only that we now have added the polynomials $g_{(l)}(\lambda, t) \in \mathbb{C}\,[\lambda, t]$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, which are assumed to be irreducible. If the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ itself is irreducible, then we have $m = 1$, $g(\lambda, t) = g_{(1)}(\lambda, t)$, and λ is an algebraic function of order n. Otherwise, in case of $m > 1$, λ consists of m algebraic functions $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, which are defined by the m polynomial equations

$$g_{(l)}(\lambda_{(l)}, t) \,=\, 0, \qquad l = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{3.2}$$

Hence, λ consists either of a single algebraic function or of several such functions, depending on whether $g(\lambda, t)$ is irreducible or not. In any case, the total number of branches λ_j is always exactly n.

Obviously, for each $t \in \mathbb{C}$, the numbers $\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t)$ are the n eigenvalues of the matrix $A - t\,B$, as it has already been stated in (1.9). Since $A - t\,B$ is an Hermitian matrix for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the restriction of each branch λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, to $\mathbb{R}$ is a real function.

From (3.1) and the Leibniz formula for determinants we deduce that

$$g(\lambda, t) \,=\, \sum_{j=0}^{n} p_j(t)\, \lambda^j \tag{3.3}$$

with $p_j \in \mathbb{C}\,[t]$, $\deg p_j \leq n - j$ for $j = 0, \ldots, n$, $p_n \equiv 1$, and $p_{n-1}(t) = t\,\mathrm{Tr}(B) - \mathrm{Tr}(A)$. If $m > 1$, then we assume the polynomials $g_{(l)}$ normalized by

$$g_{(l)}(\lambda, t) \,=\, \lambda^{n_l} \,+\, \text{lower terms in } \lambda, \qquad l = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{3.4}$$

and we have $n_1 + \ldots + n_m = n$. In situations, where we have to deal with the individual algebraic functions $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, which will, however, not often be the case, we denote the elements of a complete set of branches of the algebraic function $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, by $\lambda_{l,i}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n_l$. There exists an obvious one-to-one correspondence $j \,:\, \{\,(l, i),\ i = 1, \ldots, n_l,\ l = 1, \ldots, m\,\} \longrightarrow \{\,1, \ldots, n\,\}$ such that the set of functions $\{\,\lambda_{l,i},\ i = 1, \ldots, n_l,\ l = 1, \ldots, m\,\}$ corresponds to $\{\,\lambda_j, j = 1, \ldots, n\,\}$ bijectively.

It is in the nature of branches of a multi-valued function that their domain of definition possesses a great degree of arbitrariness. Assumptions for limiting this freedom will be addressed in Definition 2 in the next subsection.

Since the solution λ of (3.1) consists either of a single or of several algebraic functions, it is obvious that λ possesses only finitely many branch points over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$.

Lemma 4. *All branches $\lambda_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$, of the solution λ of (3.1) are of real type, i.e., any function λ_j, which is analytic in a domain $D_0 \subset \mathbb{C}$ with $D_0 \cap \mathbb{R} \neq \varnothing$, is also analytic in the domain $D_0 \cup \{\,z \,|\, \overline{z} \in D_0\,\}$, and we have $\lambda_j(\overline{z}) = \overline{\lambda_j(z)}$ for all $z \in D_0$.*

Proof. The relation $\lambda_j(\overline{z}) = \overline{\lambda_j(z)}$ follows from the identity

$$\overline{g(\lambda, t)} = \det\left(\overline{\lambda}\, I - (\overline{A} - \overline{t}\, B)\right) = \det\left(\overline{\lambda}\, I - (\overline{A}^{t} - \overline{t}\, B)\right) = g(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{t}),$$

which holds because of $\overline{A}^{t} = A^* = A$ and because of B being of the diagonal reform. Since the restriction of λ_j to $\mathbb{R}$ is real, $\overline{\lambda_j(\overline{z})}$ is an analytic continuation of λ_j across $\mathbb{R}$. □

Lemma 5. *The solution λ of (3.1) has no branch points over $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. The lemma is a consequence of the fact that the functions $\lambda_j, j = 1, \dots, n$, are of real type. We give an indirect proof, and assume that $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is a branch point of order $k \geq 1$ of a branch λ_j, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, which we can assume to be analytic in a slit neighborhood $V \diagdown (i\mathbb{R}_- + x_0)$ of x_0. Using a local coordinate at x_0 leads to the function $g(u) := \lambda_j(x_0 + u^{k+1})$, which is analytic in a neighborhood of $u = 0$. Obviously, the function g is also of real type. Let $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the smallest index in the development $g(u) = \sum_l c_l u^l$ such that $c_{l_0} \neq 0$ and $l_0 \not\equiv 0 \bmod(k+1)$, which means that there exists $0 < l_1 \leq k$ with $l_0 = m(k+1) + l_1$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Like $\lambda_j(z) = g((z - x_0)^{1/(k+1)})$, so also the modified function

$$\widetilde{\lambda}_j(z) := \left[g((z - x_0)^{1/(k+1)}) - \sum_{l=0}^{m} c_{l(k+1)} (z - x_0)^l \right] (z - x_0)^{-m}$$

has a branch point of order k at x_0, and it is of real type. We have

$$\widetilde{\lambda}_j(z) = c_{l_0} (z - x_0)^{l_1/(k+1)} + \mathrm{O}((z - x_0)^{(l_1+1)/(k+1)}) \quad \text{as} \quad z \to x_0,$$

and consequently for $r > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$\left| \arg \widetilde{\lambda}_j(x_0 + r\, e^{it}) - \arg c_{l_0} - \frac{l_1}{k+1} t \right| \leq \frac{\pi}{4(k+1)} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq t \leq \pi,$$

which implies that

$$0 < \frac{l_1 - 1/2}{(k+1)} \pi \leq \left| \arg \widetilde{\lambda}_j(x_0 + r) - \arg \widetilde{\lambda}_j(x_0 - r) \right| \leq \frac{l_1 + 1/2}{(k+1)} \pi < \pi. \tag{3.5}$$

Since the function $\widetilde{\lambda}_j$ is of real type, we have $\arg \widetilde{\lambda}_j(x_0 + r) \equiv 0 \bmod(\pi)$ and $\arg \widetilde{\lambda}_j(x_0 - r) \equiv 0 \bmod(\pi)$, which contradicts (3.5). □

Next, we investigate the behavior of the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, in the neighborhood of infinity.

Lemma 6. *Let λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, denote n different branches of the solution λ of (3.1). The system of branches can be chosen in such a way that there exists a simply connected domain $U_\lambda \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\infty \in U_\lambda$ such that the following assertions hold true:*

(i) *Each function λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, is defined throughout U_λ, and none of them has a branch point in U_λ.*

(ii) *The n functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, can be enumerated in such a way that at infinity we have*

$$\lambda_j(t) = a_{jj} - b_j t + O(1/t) \quad \textit{as} \quad t \to \infty \tag{3.6}$$

with a_{jj} and b_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, the diagonal elements of the matrices A and B, respectively.

(iii) *Each function λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, is analytic in $U_\lambda \diagdown \{\infty\}$ and univalent in U_λ.*

Remark 1. *Assumption 1 from Section 2 is decisive for the concrete form of (3.6). Notice that the similarity transformation $(A, B) \mapsto (\widetilde{A}, \widetilde{B})$ from Lemma 1 in general changes the diagonal elements a_{jj}, $j = 1, \dots, n$, of the matrix A, but the polynomial equation (3.1) remains invariant under such a transformation, and consequently, the same is true for the branches λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, of its solution. Hence, (3.6) holds true in its given form only if Assumption 1 is satisfied.*

Proof. In a first step we prove that the solution λ of (3.1) has no branch point over infinity, which then leads to a proof of assertion (i). Somewhat more involved is the proof of assertion (ii), which is done in two steps. After that assertion (iii) follows rather immediately as a consequence of Assumption 2 from Section 2.

Proof of (i): Like in the proof of Lemma 5 we prove the absence of a branch point at infinity indirectly, and assume that some function λ_j, $j \in \{ 1, \dots, n \}$, has a branch point of order $k \geq 1$ at infinity. The function λ_j is of real type, and as a branch of an algebraic function, it has at most polynomial growth for $t \to \infty$. Hence, there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the function

$$\lambda_0(z) := z^{m_0} \lambda_j(1/z)$$

is bounded in a neighborhood of $x_0 = 0$. The function λ_0 is again of real type, and it has a branch point of order $k \geq 1$ at $x_0 = 0$.

After these preparations we can copy the argumentation in the proof of Lemma 5 line by line in order to show that our assumption leads to a contradiction, which then proves that none of the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, has a branch point at infinity.

From equation (3.1) together with (3.3) we further deduce that all n functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are finite in $\mathbb{C}$.

Since the solution λ of (3.1) possesses only finitely many branch points and none of them at infinity. The branches $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ can be chosen in such a way that there exists a punctured neighborhood of infinity in which all n functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are defined and analytic, which concludes the proof of assertion (i). At infinity the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, may have a pole. In the next part of the proof we shall see that this is indeed the case, and the poles are always simple ones.

Proof of (ii): The proof of (3.6) will be done in two steps. In the first one we determine a necessary condition for the leading coefficient of the development of the function λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, at infinity.

Let λ_0 denote one of the functions $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. From part (i) we know that there exists an open, simply connected neighborhood $U_0 \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of ∞ such that λ_0 is analytic in $U_0 \diagdown \{\infty\}$ and meromorphic in U_0. Hence, λ_0 can be represented as

$$\lambda_0 = p + v \tag{3.7}$$

with p a polynomial and v a function analytic in U_0 with $v(\infty) = 0$. We will show that the polynomial p is necessarily of the form

$$p(t) = c_0 - c_1 t \quad \text{with} \quad c_1 \in \{ b_1, \dots, b_n \}. \tag{3.8}$$

The proof will be done indirectly, and we assume that

$$\deg p \neq 1 \quad \text{or} \quad p(t) = c_0 - c_1 t \ \text{ with } \ c_1 \notin \{ b_1, \dots, b_n \}. \tag{3.9}$$

From (3.9) and the assumption made with respect to v after (3.7), it follows that

$$|p(t) + b_j t - a_{jj} + v(t)| \to \infty \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty \ \text{ for each } \ j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{3.10}$$

From the definition of $g(\lambda, t)$ in (3.1) and the Leibniz formula for determinants we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} g(\lambda_0(t), t) = \prod_{j=0}^{n} (p(t) + b_j t - a_{jj} + v(t)) + \\ + \, \mathrm{O}\left(\max_{j=1,\dots,n} |p(t) + b_j t - a_{jj} + v(t)|^{n-2} \right) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Indeed, the product in (3.11) is built from the diagonal elements of the matrix $\lambda_0(t)\, I - (A - t\, B)$, and any other term in the Leibniz formula contains at least two off-diagonal elements as factors, which leads to the error term in the second line of (3.11). From (3.9), (3.10), and Assumption 2 in Section 2 we deduce that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{|p(t)+b_k t - a_{kk} + v(t)|}{\max_{j=1,\dots,n}|p(t)+b_j t - a_{jj} + v(t)|} \;>\; 0 \quad \text{for each} \quad k=1,\dots,n,$$

which implies that

$$\max_{j=1,\dots,n} |p(t)+b_j t - a_{jj} + v(t)|^{2-n} \prod_{j=0}^{n} |p(t)+b_j t - a_{jj} + v(t)| \to \infty \tag{3.12}$$

as $t\to\infty$. From (3.11) together with (3.12) it then follows that $g(\lambda_0(t),t)\to\infty$ as $t\to\infty$. But this contradicts $g(\lambda_0(t),t)=0$ for $t\in U_0$, and the contradiction proves the assertion made in (3.8).

We now come to the second step of the proof of (ii). Because of (3.8) we can make the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j \;&=\; p_j + v_j \quad \text{for} \quad j=1,\dots,n, \quad \text{and} \\ p_j(t) \;&=\; c_{0j} - c_{1j}t \quad \text{with} \quad c_{1j}\in\{\,b_1,\dots,b_n\,\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

v_j analytic in a neighborhood U_0 of infinity, and $v_j(\infty)=0$. We shall show that the functions $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n$ can be enumerated in such a way that we have

$$c_{1j} \;=\; b_j \quad \text{and} \quad c_{0j} = a_{jj} \quad \text{for each} \quad j=1,\dots,n,$$

which proves (3.6).

A transformation of the variables λ and t into w and u is introduced by

$$u \;:=\; 1/t \quad \text{and} \quad w \;:=\; \frac{1}{\lambda + b_1 t - a_{00}} \tag{3.14}$$

with

$$a_{00} \;:=\; \min\left(\{\,c_{11},\dots,c_{1n}\,\}\cup\{\,b_1,\dots,b_n\,\}\right) \;-\; 2. \tag{3.15}$$

From (3.14) it follows that

$$\lambda \;=\; \frac{1}{w} - b_1 t + a_{00} \;=\; \frac{1}{w} - \frac{b_1}{u} + a_{00}. \tag{3.16}$$

There exists an obvious one-to-one correspondence between the n functions λ_j, $j=1,\dots,n$, and the n functions

$$w_j(u) \;:=\; \frac{1}{\lambda_j(1/u) + b_1/u - a_{00}}, \quad j=1,\dots,n. \tag{3.17}$$

The functions w_j, $j=1,\dots,n$, are meromorphic in a neighborhood $\widetilde{U}_0$ of the origin. From (3.13) and (3.17) we deduce that

$$w_j(0) \;=\; \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for} \quad c_{1j}\neq b_1 \\ \dfrac{1}{c_{0j}-a_{00}} \;\le\; \dfrac{1}{2} & \text{for} \quad c_{1j} = b_1 \end{cases}, \tag{3.18}$$

and therefore we can choose $\widetilde{U}_0$ so small that

$$0 \;<\; |w_j(u)| \;\le\; 1 \quad \text{for} \quad u\in\widetilde{U}_0\diagdown\{0\}, \tag{3.19}$$

which implies that all w_j, $j=1,\dots,n$, are analytic in $\widetilde{U}_0$.

By $V(u)$, $u\in\mathbb{C}\diagdown\{0\}$, we denote the $n\times n$ diagonal matrix

$$V(u) \;:=\; \operatorname{diag}(\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{m_1},\underbrace{\sqrt{u},\dots,\sqrt{u}}_{n-m_1}), \tag{3.20}$$

where m_1 is the number of appearances of b_1 in the multiset $\{ b_1, \dots, b_n \} = \{ b_j, j = 1, \dots, n \}$, and define

$$\widetilde{g}(w,u) \;:=\; \det\big(V(u)^2 + w\,(B - b_1 I) - w\,V(u)(A - a_{00}I)V(u)\big)\,. \tag{3.21}$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}(w,u) &= \det\Big(V(u)\Big(I + \frac{w}{u}\,(B - b_1 I) - w\,(A - a_{00}I)\Big)\,V(u)\Big)\\ &= w^n u^{n-m_1}\det\Big(\frac{1}{w}I + \frac{1}{u}\,(B - b_1 I) - (A - a_{00}I)\Big)\\ &= w^n u^{n-m_1}\det\Big(\Big(\frac{1}{w} - \frac{b_1}{u} + a_{00}\Big)\,I - \Big(A - \frac{1}{u}B\Big)\Big)\\ &= w^n u^{n-m_1} g(\lambda, \frac{1}{u}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Indeed, the first equality is obvious if we take into account that $B - b_1 I = \mathrm{diag}(\,0, \dots, 0, b_{m_1+1} - b_1, \dots, b_n - b_1\,)$ with exactly m_1 zeros in its diagonal. The next three equations result from elementary transformations.

Directly from (3.21), but also from (3.3) and (3.22) together with (3.16) we deduce that $\widetilde{g}(w,u)$ is a polynomial in w and u, and it is of order n in w.

From (3.21) together with properties used in (3.22) and the Leibniz formula for determinants it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}(w,u) \;=\; \prod_{j=1}^{m_1}(1 - w(a_{jj} - a_{00})) \prod_{j=m_1+1}^{n} (u - w(b_j - b_1) - w\,u(a_{jj} - a_{00}))\\ +\;\mathrm{O}\,(u) \quad \text{as} \quad u \to 0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Indeed, the product in (3.23) is formed by the diagonal elements of the matrix $M := V(u)^2 + w\,(B - b_1 I) - w\,V(u)(A - a_{00}I)V(u)$, and the error term $\mathrm{O}(u)$ in the second line of (3.23) results from the fact that each other term in the Leibniz formula includes at least two off-diagonal elements of the matrix M as factors. Each off-diagonal element of M contains the factor $\sqrt{u}$, or it is zero since from Assertion 1 in Section 2 it follows that for all elements m_{ij} of $M = (m_{ij})$ with $i, j = 1, \dots, m_1$, $i \neq j$, we have $m_{ij} = 0$.

With (3.23) we are prepared to describe the behavior of the functions $w_1, \dots, w_n$ near $u = 0$, which then translates into a proof of a first part of (3.6).

For $u \in \mathbb{C}$ fixed, the n values $w_1(u), \dots, w_n(u)$ are the zeros of the polynomial $\widetilde{g}(w,u) \in \mathbb{C}\,[w]$. From (3.23) we know that

$$\widetilde{g}(w,u) \;\to\; w^{n-m_1}\prod_{j=1}^{m_1}(1 - w(a_{jj} - a_{00})) \prod_{j=m_1+1}^{n} (b_j - b_1) \quad \text{as} \quad u \to 0.$$

Therefore it follows by Roché's Theorem that with an appropriate enumeration of the functions w_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\lim_{u\to 0} w_j(u) \;=\; \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{a_{jj} - a_{00}} & \text{for} \quad j = 1, \dots, m_1 \\ 0 & \text{for} \quad j = m_1 + 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \tag{3.24}$$

which is a concretization of (3.18). Since we know from (3.19) that all functions w_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are analytic in a neighborhood $\widetilde{U}_0$ of the origin, it follows from (3.24) that

$$w_j(u) \;=\; \frac{1}{a_{jj} - a_{00}} + \mathrm{O}(u) \quad \text{as} \quad u \to 0 \;\; \text{for} \;\; j = 1, \dots, m_1. \tag{3.25}$$

From the correspondence (3.17) between the functions w_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, it then follows from (3.25) that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_j(t) &= \frac{1}{w_j(1/t)} - b_1 t + a_{00}\\ &= a_{jj} - a_{00} - b_1 t + a_{00} + \mathrm{O}(\frac{1}{t})\\ &= a_{jj} - b_j t + \mathrm{O}(\frac{1}{t}) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \ldots, m_1.\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

The last equation is a consequence of $b_j = b_1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m_1$. With (3.26) we have proved relation (3.6) for $j = 1, \ldots, m_1$.

By the definition of m_1 and the ordering in (2.3) we have

$$b_{m_1+1} > b_{m_1} = \ldots = b_1.$$

Let now m_2 denote the number of appearances of the value b_{m_1+1} in the multiset $\{ b_j, j = 1, \ldots, n \}$. In order to prove relation (3.26) for $j = m_1 + 1, \ldots, m_1 + m_2$, we repeat the analysis from (3.14) until (3.26) with, b_1 replaced by b_{m_1+1} and m_1 by m_2, which then leads to the verification of (3.26) for $j = m_1 + 1, \ldots, m_1 + m_2$.

Repeating this cycle of analysis for each different value b_j in the multiset $\{ b_j, j = 1, \ldots, n \}$ proves relation (3.26) for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, which completes the proof of (3.6), and concludes the proof of assertion (ii).

We would like to add as a short remark that if all b_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, were pairwise different, then the analysis in these last cycles could be considerably shortened since in such a case one could proceed rather directly from (3.18) to the conclusion (3.26).

Proof of (iii): In the proof of assertion (i) it has already been shown that the functions $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ are analytic in a punctured neighborhood of infinity. From Assumption 2 in Section 2 it follows that $b_j > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and therefore it is a consequence of (3.6) that each function λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is univalent in the domain U_λ if U_λ is chosen sufficiently small. □

3.2. The Complex Manifold $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$.

If the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ in (3.1) is irreducible, then the solution λ of (3.1) is an algebraic function of order n, and therefore its natural domain of definition is a compact Riemann surface with n sheets over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ (cf., [**4**, Theorem IV.11.4]). We denote this surface by $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$.

If, however, the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ is reducible, then we have seen in (3.1) and (3.2) that the solution λ of (3.1) consists of m algebraic functions $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$. Each $\lambda_{(l)}$ has a compact Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda,l}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, as its natural domain of definition, and therefore the complex manifold

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda := \mathcal{R}_{\lambda,1} \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{R}_{\lambda,m} \tag{3.27}$$

is the natural domain of definition for the multivalued function λ. In each of the two cases, $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ is a covering of $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ with exactly n sheets, only that in the later case $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ is no longer connected. By $\pi_\lambda : \mathcal{R}_\lambda \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ we denote canonical projection of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$.

A collection of subsets $\left\{ S_\lambda^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda,\ j = 1, \ldots, n \right\}$ is called a system of sheets on $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ if the following three requirements are satisfied:

(i) The restriction $\pi_\lambda|_{S_\lambda^{(j)}} : S_\lambda^{(j)} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ of the canonical projection π_λ is a bijection for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

(ii) We have $\bigcup_{j=1}^n S_\lambda^{(j)} = \mathcal{R}_\lambda$.

(iii) The inner points of each sheet $S_\lambda^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, form a domain. Different sheets are disjoint except for branch points. A branch point of order $k \geq 1$ belongs to exactly $k+1$ sheets.

Because of requirement (i) each sheet $S_\lambda^{(j)}$ can be identified with $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, however, formally we consider it as a subset of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$.

While the association of branch points and sheets is specified completely in requirement (iii), there remains freedom with respect to the other boundary points of sheets. We assume that this association is done in a pragmatic way. It is only required that each boundary point belongs to exactly one sheet if it is not a branch point.

Requirement (i) justifies the notational convention that a point of $S_\lambda^{(j)}$ is denoted by $t^{(j)}$ if $\pi_\lambda(t^{(j)}) = t \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$.

The requirements (i) - (iii) give considerable freedom for choosing a system of sheets on $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$. In order to get unambiguity we define a standard system of sheets by the following additional requirement.

(iv) The cuts, which separate different sheets $S_\lambda^{(j)}$ in $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, lie over lines in $\mathbb{C}$ that are perpendicular to $\mathbb{R}$. Each cut is chosen in a minimal way. Hence, it begins and ends with a branch point.

Lemma 7. *There exists a system of sheets $S_\lambda^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, that satisfy the requirements (i) through (iv). Such a system is essentially unique, i.e., unique up to the association of boundary points as mentioned in requirement (iii). The domain U_λ from Lemma 6 can be chosen in such a way that each sheet $S_\lambda^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, of the standard system covers U_λ, i.e., we have*

$$\pi_\lambda(S_\lambda^{(j)}) \supset U_\lambda. \tag{3.28}$$

Proof. From part (i) of Lemma 6 it is evident that there exist n unramified subdomains in $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ over the domain U_λ; they are given by the set $\pi_\lambda^{-1}(U_\lambda)$. We can choose $U_\lambda \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ as a disc around ∞. Because of Lemma 4 and 5 it is then always possible to start an analytic continuation of a given branch λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, at ∞ and continue along rays that are perpendicular to $\mathbb{R}$ until one hits a branch point. This later case can happen only finitely many times. Each of these continuations then defines a sheet $S_\lambda^{(j)}$, and the whole system satisfies the requirements (i) through (iv), and also (3.28) is satisfied. □

Each system $\left\{S_\lambda^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda,\ j = 1, \dots, n\right\}$ of sheets corresponds to a complete system of branches λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, of the solution λ of (3.1) if we define the functions λ_j by

$$\lambda_j := \lambda \circ \pi_{t,j}^{-1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \tag{3.29}$$

with $\pi_{\lambda,j}^{-1}$ being the inverse of $\pi_\lambda|_{S_\lambda^{(j)}}$, which exists because of requirement (i). If we use the standard system of sheets, then the branches λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are uniquely defined functions, and we have overcome the problem of the otherwise existing ambiguity of their domains of definition.

Definition 2. *In the sequel we denote by λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, the n branches of the solution λ of equation (3.1) that are defined by (3.29) with the standard system $\left\{S_\lambda^{(j)}\right\}$ of sheets.*

The next Lemma is an immediate consequence of the monodromy theorem.

Lemma 8. *Let λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, be the functions from Definition 2. Then for any entire function g the function*

$$G(t) \,=\, \sum_{j=1}^{n} g(\lambda_j(t)), \qquad t \in \mathbb{C},$$

is analytic and single-valued throughout $\mathbb{C}$.

With the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, we get a very helpful representation of the function f from (1.1) and of the determinant $\det(\zeta I - (A - tB))$.

Lemma 9. *With the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, from Definition 2, the function f from (1.1) can be represented as*

$$f(t) \,=\, Tr\, e^{A - tB} \,=\, \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\lambda_j(t)} \quad \textit{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{3.30}$$

It follows from Lemma 8 that f is an entire function.

PROOF. From equation (3.1) it follows that for any $t \in \mathbb{C}$ the n numbers $\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t)$ are the eigenvalues of the the matrix $A - t\,B$. Let $V_\lambda \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the set of all $t \in \mathbb{C}$ such that not all $\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t)$ are pairwise different. This set is finite. For every $t \in \mathbb{C} \diagdown V_\lambda$ the n eigenvectors corresponding to $\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t)$ form an eigenbasis. The $n \times n$ matrix $T_0 = T_0(t)$ having these vectors as columns satisfies

$$T_0^{-1}(A - t\,B)T_0 = \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1(t), \ldots, \lambda_n(t))\,. \tag{3.31}$$

Since the trace of a square matrix is invariant under similarity transformations, (3.30) follows from (3.31) and (1.1) for $t \notin V_\lambda$, and by continuity for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$. ☐

Lemma 10. *With the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, from Definition 2 we have*

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n}(\zeta - \lambda_j(t)) \,=\, \det(\zeta I - (A - tB)) \quad \textit{for} \quad \zeta, t \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{3.32}$$

PROOF. From (3.31) we deduce that

$$T_0^{-1}\,(\zeta I - (A - tB))\,T_0 = \operatorname{diag}(\zeta - \lambda_1(t), \ldots, \zeta - \lambda_n(t))$$

for each $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t \in \mathbb{C} \diagdown V_\lambda$, which then proves (3.32). ☐

3.3. The Functions $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n$.

As a second polynomial equation we consider

$$\widehat{g}(\tau, z) := \det\left(\tau\,I - (\widehat{A} - z\,\widehat{B})\right) = 0 \tag{3.33}$$

with $\widehat{A} := B^{-1/2} A\, B^{-1/2}$ and $\widehat{B} := B^{-1}$. Equation (3.33) has a structure that is identical to that of equation (3.1), and therefore its solution τ will have the same properties as that proved for the solution λ of (3.1) in the last two subsections. We will give some more details.

It is immediate that the two matrices $\widehat{A}$ and $\widehat{B}$ are Hermitian and that the Assumptions 1 and 2 from Section 2, which have been assumed to be satisfied for the matrices A and B, are also satisfied by the two new matrices $\widehat{A}$ and $\widehat{B}$. Further, we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{g}(\tau, z) &= \det\left(\tau\,I - (B^{-1/2} A\, B^{-1/2} - z\,B^{-1})\right) \\ &= \det(\tau\,B + z\,I - A\,)\det(B)^{-1} \,=\, g(z, \tau)\det(B)^{-1}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

which shows that the polynomial $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ is irreducible if, and only if, $g(z, \tau)$ in (3.1) is irreducible. In case of reducibility, both polynomials $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ and $g(z, \tau)$ possess the same number of irreducible factors with pairwise identical degrees. Therefore, the solution τ of equation (3.33) is either an algebraic function of degree n, or it consists of several algebraic functions in the same way as it has been described for the solution λ of (3.1).

If the polynomial $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ is irreducible, then the natural domain of definition for the solution τ is a compact Riemann surface with n sheets over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{R}_\tau$. If, however, $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ is irreducible, then the natural domain of definition of τ is the complex manifold

$$\mathcal{R}_\tau := \mathcal{R}_{\tau,1} \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{R}_{\tau,m} \tag{3.35}$$

with $\mathcal{R}_{\tau,l}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, being compact Riemann surfaces, which are defined by the irreducible factors of $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ in the same way as it has been described before and after (3.27) for the solution λ of (3.1).

Because of the structural analogies between the equations (3.33) and (3.1), we can prove the same properties for the solution τ of (3.33), its branches τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and the complex manifold $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ as have been proved for λ, λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ in the Lemmas 4 through 8, and 10 in the last two subsections. For later use we compile these results in the following lemma.

Lemma 11. *There exists a simply connected domain $U_\tau \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\infty \in U_\tau$ such that*

(i) *The solution τ of equation (3.33) has no branch point in U_τ.*

(ii) *The solution τ has exactly n branches τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and they can be enumerated in such a way that*

$$\tau_j(z) = \frac{a_{jj}}{b_j} - \frac{1}{b_j} z + O(1/z) \quad \text{as} \quad z \to \infty. \tag{3.36}$$

(iii) *Each branch τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is analytic in $U_\tau \setminus \{\infty\}$ and univalent in U_τ.*

(iv) *The Lemmas 4 and 5 hold also for the solution τ, i.e., τ is of real type, and it has no branch points over $\mathbb{R}$.*

(v) *Lemma 8 holds also for the branches τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.*

(vi) *Lemma 10 holds also for the branches τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, i.e., we have*

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n} (\tau - \tau_j(z)) = \det\Big(\tau I - (\widehat{A} - z\,\widehat{B})\Big) \quad \text{for} \quad \tau, z \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{3.37}$$

The simply connected domains U_λ and U_τ in Lemma 6 and 11, respectively, are in general different.

The canonical projection of the manifold $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ is denoted by $\pi_\tau : \mathcal{R}_\tau \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$, and systems of sheets on $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ by $\Big\{S_\tau^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{R}_\tau,\ j = 1, \ldots, n\Big\}$. Again, we assume that these systems satisfy the requirements (i), (ii), (iii) stated in the last subsection for $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, and their standard form is defined by the additional requirement (iv), where now the domain U_λ is replaced by U_τ.

Definition 3. *Analogously to Definition 2, we denote the n branches of the solution τ of equation (3.33) that are determined by the standard system $\Big\{S_\tau^{(j)}\Big\}$ of sheets on $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ by τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, in the sequel.*

Lemma 12. *With the domains U_λ and U_τ from Lemma 6 and 11 we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_j(t) = \tau_j^{-1}(t) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in U_\lambda \quad \text{and} \\ &\tau_j(z) = \lambda_j^{-1}(z) \quad \text{for} \quad z \in U_\tau, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

The image values of the two multivalued functions λ *and* τ *can be lifted to* $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ *and* $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$*, respectively, in such a way that for the lifted functions* $\widehat{\lambda} : \mathcal{R}_\lambda \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_\tau$ *and* $\widehat{\tau} : \mathcal{R}_\tau \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_\lambda$ *we have* $\lambda = \pi_\tau \circ \widehat{\lambda}$ *and* $\tau = \pi_\lambda \circ \widehat{\tau}$*. Then the two functions* $\widehat{\lambda}$ *and* $\widehat{\tau}$ *are mutually universe, i.e., we have*

$$\widehat{\lambda} = \widehat{\tau}^{-1}. \tag{3.39}$$

Proof. The inverse relation (3.39) and the possibility of lifting the image values of the functions λ and τ to $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, respectively, is a consequence of identity (3.34). The inverse relations (3.38) then follow from (3.39) together with assertions (iii) in Lemma 6 and 11. □

If the polynomials $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ and $g(z, \tau)$ in (3.33) and (3.1) are irreducible, and therefore the covering manifolds $\mathcal{R}_\tau$ and $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ both are Riemann surfaces, then it follows from (3.39) that these two surfaces are conformally equivalent, and consequently identical in an abstract sense. However, as concrete Riemann surfaces over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$, they are different objects, and this difference is very important and decisive for our subsequent analysis. The same conclusion holds, by the way, also for the individual pairs $(\mathcal{R}_{\tau,l}, \mathcal{R}_{\lambda,l})$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, of Riemann surfaces from (3.35) and (3.27) if the polynomials $\widehat{g}(\tau, z)$ and $g(z, \tau)$ are not irreducible.

3.4. Representations for the Functions f and $f^{(k)}$.

With the help of the functions λ_j and τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, from Definition 2 and 3 we prove integral representations for the function f from (1.1) and its derivatives $f^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$.

Definition 4. *A rectifiable Jordan arc* $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}\diagdown\mathbb{R}_-$ *is called a Hankel contour if it surrounds* $\mathbb{R}_-$ *with a positive orientation and if it is contained in a sector* $\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |\arg(z - a) + \pi| < \frac{\pi}{2} \}$ *with* $a > 0$*. By* $\mathrm{Int}(\Gamma)$ *we denote the component of* $\mathbb{C}\diagdown\Gamma$ *that contains* $\mathbb{R}_-$*, and by* $\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma)$ *the other component of* $\mathbb{C}\diagdown\Gamma$*.*

Lemma 13. *For the function* f *from (1.1) we have the representation*

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta - \lambda_j(t)} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{3.40}$$

where Γ *is a Hankel contour that satisfies*

$$\Gamma \subset U_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma) \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{3.41}$$

and further we have

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\tau_j'(\zeta) d\zeta}{\tau_j(\zeta) - t} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{3.42}$$

where Γ *is a Hankel contour that satisfies*

$$\Gamma \subset U_\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma) \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{3.43}$$

Remark 2. *In (3.41) and (3.43),* U_λ *and* U_τ *is the domain from Lemma 6 and 11, respectively. From (3.6) and (3.36) together with Assumption 1 from Section 2, Lemma 4, and assertion (iv) in Lemma 11, it follows that there exists* $a \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\lambda_j(\mathbb{R}_+), \tau_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset (-\infty, a]$ *for all* $j = 1, \ldots, n$*, which shows that there always exists a Hankel contours* Γ *which satisfy (3.41) and (3.43).*

Proof. Let λ_j and τ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, be the functions from Definition 2 and 3, and let a Hankel contour Γ be chosen in such a way that $\Gamma \subset U_\tau \cap U_\lambda$ and $\lambda_j(\mathbb{R}_+), \tau_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. For $t \geq 0$ we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\lambda_j(t)} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{d\zeta}{\zeta - \lambda_j(t)} \\
&= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log(\zeta - \lambda_j(t)) d\zeta \\
&= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \log\det\left(\zeta I - (A - tB)\right) d\zeta \qquad (3.44)\\
&= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \log\det\Big(\zeta B^{-1} - (B^{-1/2} A B^{-1/2} - tI)\Big) d\zeta \\
&\qquad\qquad + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \log\det(B)\, d\zeta \\
&= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \log\det\Big(t\,I - (\widehat{A} - \zeta \widehat{B})\Big) d\zeta \\
&= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \log\left(t - \tau_j(\zeta)\right) d\zeta \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\tau_j'(\zeta) d\zeta}{\tau_j(\zeta) - t}.
\end{aligned}$$

In (3.44), the logarithm is defined in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_-$ in the usual way. The first equality in (3.44) has been proved in Lemma 9. The second one follows from Cauchy's formula, which is applicable to Γ and the exponential function e^ζ. Notice that $\lambda_j(t) \in \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$.

The third equality in (3.44) follows from partial integration. The fourth one has been proved in Lemma 10. The fifth one is the result of elementary transformations. The second integral in the fifth line of (3.44) is identical zero, which together with the introduction of the matrices $\widehat{A}$ and $\widehat{B}$ after (3.33) verifies the sixth equality. The seventh one follows from assertion (vi) in Lemma 11, and the last one is a consequence of partial integration.

Representation (3.40) has been proved by the second line in (3.44), and representation (3.42) by the last line in (3.44). □

Lemma 14. *For the derivatives of the function f from (1.1) we have*

$$f^{(k)}(t) = \frac{(k-1)!}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\tau_j(\zeta) - t)^{-k} d\zeta \qquad (3.45)$$

for $t \geq 0$, $k = 1, 2, \dots,$ and Γ a Hankel contour that satisfies

$$\Gamma \subset U_\tau \quad \textit{and} \quad \tau_j(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma) \quad \textit{for all} \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Starting from the penultimate line in (3.44), we get

$$f'(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\tau_j(\zeta) - t)^{-1} d\zeta,$$

and (3.45) follows immediately.

An alternative proof of (3.45) could start from the last line in (3.44), which leads to

$$f^{(k)}(t) = \frac{k!}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^\zeta \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\tau_j'(\zeta) d\zeta}{(\tau_j(\zeta) - t)^{k+1}} d\zeta,$$

and from this we get (3.45) by partial integration. □

4. Asymptotic Approximations

In the present section, we prove an asymptotic approximation of $f^{(k)}(k/t)$ for $k \to \infty$ that holds uniformly for $t > 0$. As starting point we take (3.45) in Lemma 14. The main result is stated in Proposition 2, and three important special cases are formulated in subsequent corollaries. The remainder of the section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2.

4.1. Central Result.

Proposition 2. *Let f be the function from (1.1), then we have*

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) \;=\; (-1)^k \left(1 + O(k^{-1/4})\right) \left[\frac{k!}{\sqrt{k\,2\pi}} \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^k \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_{jj}}\, \psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k - \right.$$

$$\left. -\; k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \sum_{t<b_j} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \right] \tag{4.1}$$

as $k \to \infty$ for $t > 0$. The function ψ is defined in (4.2), the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, have been introduced in Definition 2, each integration path C_j is a positively oriented Jordan curve that is chosen in such a way that the corresponding function λ_j is analytic in its exterior, and the error term $O(k^{-1/4})$ holds uniformly for all $t > 0$.

We have

$$\psi(t) \;:=\; t\, e^{1-t} \begin{cases} = 1 & \text{for} \;\; t = 1 \\ \in (0,1) & \text{for} \;\; t \in (0,\infty)/\{1\}. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Since the function ψ peaks at $t = 1$, all relevant contributions of the sum in the first line of (4.1) are asymptotically concentrated at the n points $t = b_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

In the next three corollaries, the result in Proposition 2 is specialized in directions that are relevant in Section 5 for different aspects of the Koch-Widder inversion formula. The proof of Proposition 2 is then given in the remaining three subsections.

Corollary 1. *For $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $t = b_j$ we have*

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{b_j}) = (-1)^k \left(\frac{b_j}{e}\right)^k e^{a_{jj}} \left(1 + O(k^{-1/4})\right) \quad \textit{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. By Stirling's formula $n! = n^n e^{-n} \sqrt{2\pi\, n}\,(1 + \mathrm{O}(1/n))$ as $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\frac{k!}{\sqrt{2\pi k}} \left(\frac{b_j}{k}\right)^k = \left(\frac{b_j}{e}\right)^k \left(1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$k! \left(\frac{b_j}{k}\right)^{k+1} = \frac{b_j}{k} k! \left(\frac{e}{k}\right)^k \left(\frac{b_j}{e}\right)^k = \mathrm{O}(k^{-1/2}) \left(\frac{b_j}{e}\right)^k \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

The last estimate shows that the term in the second line of (4.1) is negligible in comparison to that in the first line. From (4.2) we know that $\psi(b_j/b_j) = 1$ and $\theta := \max\{\, \psi(b_l/b_j) \,|\, l = 1, \ldots, n, l \neq j \,\} < 1$, which implies that

$$\sum_{l=1,\ i\neq j}^{n} e^{a_{ll}} \psi(\frac{b_l}{b_j})^k = \mathrm{O}(\theta^k) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Relation (4.2) then follows from the first line in (4.1), (4.4), and the last estimate. □

Corollary 2. *For $t \in [b_1, b_n] \diagdown \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) &= (-1)^{k+1} k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \left(1 + O(k^{-1/4})\right) \sum_{t<b_j} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \\ &= (-1)^k k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \left(1 + O(k^{-1/4})\right) \sum_{b_j<t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

as $k \to \infty$. The objects C_j and λ_j are the same as in Proposition 2. The error term $O\big(k^{-1/4}\big)$ holds uniformly for t on compact subsets of $[b_1, b_n] \diagdown \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$.

Proof. From (4.2) it follows that for each compact subsets $V \subset [b_1, b_n] \diagdown \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ there exists θ with

$$\max_{l=1,\ldots,n} \psi(\frac{b_l}{t}) \,\leq\, \theta \,<\, 1 \quad \text{for} \quad t \in V,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{k}{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}} \sum_{l=1}^{n} e^{a_{ll}} \psi(\frac{b_l}{t})^k = \mathrm{O}\left(\sqrt{k}\, \theta^k\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty$$

uniformly for $t \in V$. The last estimate then ensures that the expression in the first line of (4.1) is negligible in comparison to the expression in the second line for $t \in V$, which proves the first line of (4.5). The second line of (4.5) is a consequence of (4.8) in Lemma 15, bellow. □

Corollary 3. *We have*

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \begin{cases} O\left(\sqrt{k}\, \psi(\frac{b_1}{t})^{k-1}\right) & \text{for} \quad 0 < t < b_1 \\ O\left(\sqrt{k}\, \psi(\frac{b_n}{t})^{k}\right) & \text{for} \quad b_n < t < \infty \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

as $k \to \infty$ with error terms $O(\cdot)$ that are independent of t.

Proof. From Lemma 15, bellow, it follows that the expression in the second line of (4.1) is identical zero for $t \in (0, b_1) \cup (b_n, \infty)$. Consequently, we deduce from (4.1) that

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{1}{t}\,\sqrt{k}\, \psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty,\ t \in (0, \infty)/[b_1, b_n]. \tag{4.7}$$

Since the function ψ is strictly increasing in $(0, 1)$ and strictly decreasing in $(1, \infty)$, estimate (4.6) follows from (4.7), the monotonicity of ψ, and the observation that $t\,\psi(t) \leq 4/e$ for all $t \geq 0$. The independence of the error terms $\mathrm{O}(\cdot)$ from t follows from the last estimates and from the same property of the error term in Proposition 2. □

Lemma 15. *For each* $t > 0$ *we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta} d\zeta \;=\; 0 \tag{4.8}$$

with C_j *and* λ_j *as specified in Proposition 2.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that in (4.8) all curves C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are identical with a single curve C. We interchange summation and integration in (4.8), and then deduce from Lemma 8 that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}$ is an entire function, which proves (4.8). □

4.2. Preparation of the Proof of Propositions 2. Our point of departure for the proof of Propositions 2 is the representation

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = \frac{(-1)^k(k-1)!}{2\pi i} \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^k \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{\Gamma} e^{\zeta}(1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(\zeta))^{-k} d\zeta, \tag{4.9}$$

which is practically identical with formula (3.45) in Lemma 14. The functions τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, have been introduced in Definition 3, and $t > 0$. With the variable substitution

$$\zeta = k\frac{b_j}{t}\,z + a_{jj}, \quad z = \frac{t}{k\,b_j}(\zeta - a_{jj}), \tag{4.10}$$

we then get

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = \frac{(-1)^k(k-1)!}{2\pi i} \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j e^{a_{jj}} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\,dz}{(1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}z + a_{jj}))^k}. \tag{4.11}$$

Notice that the substitution (4.10) depends on the index j of the function τ_j in question. Therefore, it is a different one in each of the n integrals in (4.9). In (4.9) the integration path Γ is a Hankel contour that satisfies the conditions (3.43) in Lemma 13. In (4.11) the conditions for Γ have changed, Γ has now to be a Hankel contour that contains all branch points of the functions $\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}(\cdot) + a_{jj})$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, $k = k_0, k_0+1, \ldots$, in its interior $\mathrm{Int}\,(\Gamma)$, and in addition it is necessary that $k/t \notin \tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}\,\mathrm{Ext}\,(\Gamma) + a_{jj})$. These requirements are fulfilled by any Hankel contour in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\_}$ if k/t is sufficiently large. Despite of this last rather simply sounding statement, the choice of an appropriate integration path Γ will be a major topic in the sequel, and we will give more detailed further below.

Next, we introduce the remainder functions r_{jk}, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, by

$$r_{jk}(z) \;:=\; -z \;-\; \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}z + a_{jj}), \tag{4.12}$$

which, with (4.11), yields that

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = (-1)^k(k-1)! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j e^{a_{jj}} I_{1,k}(j,t) \tag{4.13}$$

with the abbreviation $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ for the integral

$$I_{1,k}(j,t) \;:=\; \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\,dz}{(1 + z + r_{jk}(z))^k}, \tag{4.14}$$

$j = 1, \ldots, n$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, and $t > 0$.

Lemma 16. *There exists* $R > 0$ *and* $c_0 < \infty$ *such that for all* $j = 1, \ldots, n$ *and* $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, *the following two assertions hold true.*

(i) *The function* r_{jk} *is analytic in* $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \diagdown \{\, |z| \;\leq\; Rt/k \,\}$.

(ii) *We have*

$$|r_{jk}(z)| \leq c_0 \frac{t^2}{k^2\,|z|} \qquad \textit{for all} \quad |z| \geq Rt/k. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. From assertion (i) in Lemma 11 we know that there exists $R > 0$ such that each function τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is analytic in $\{\,|\zeta| > b_j(R - 1 + |a_{jj}|/b_j)\,\}$. From (4.10) and (4.12) we then deduce that the function r_{jk} is analytic in $\{\,|z| > (R-1)\,t/k\,\}$, and this proves assertion (i).

From (4.12) and the development (3.36) in Lemma 11 of τ_j at infinity it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{jk}(z) &= z + \frac{t}{k}\left(\frac{a_{jj}}{b_j} - \frac{1}{b_j}(b_j \frac{k}{t}\, z + a_{jj}) + \mathrm{O}(\frac{1}{b_j \frac{k}{t}\, z + a_{jj}})\right) \\ &= \frac{t}{k}\mathrm{O}(\frac{1}{b_j \frac{k}{t}\, z + a_{jj}}) \qquad \text{as} \qquad z \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $r_{jk}(\infty) = 0$. Since the function τ_j does not depend on t or k, we deduce from (4.12) that $\frac{k}{t} r_{jk}(z)$ is uniformly bounded on $\{\,|z| = Rt/k\,\}$ for $t > 0$ and $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. Therefore, there exists $c_0 < \infty$ such that

$$\frac{k}{t}\,|r_{jk}(z)| \leq \frac{c_0}{R} \qquad \text{for all} \quad |z| = \frac{Rt}{k},$$

and (4.15) follows by the Schwarz Lemma. □

4.3. A Model Problem.

The main task in the proof of Propositions 2 is the asymptotic approximation of the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ introduced in (4.14). In a kind of prelude to this task, we study the asymptotic approximation of the integral

$$I_{0,k}(j,t) = I_{0,k} := \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\Gamma e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\frac{dz}{(z+1)^k} \quad \text{for} \quad k \to \infty, \tag{4.16}$$

$j = 1, \ldots, n$, and $t > 0$. In (4.16), Γ is an arbitrary Hankel contour in $\mathbb{C}\backslash(-\infty, -1)$. Obviously, $I_{0,k}(j,t)$ is a simplification of the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ from (4.14). Its asymptotic approximation is seen here as a model problem that will provide useful definitions for the analysis of the original integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$.

Throughout the subsection we keep $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $t > 0$ fixed if it is not stated otherwise. As a general notational policy we will not mention he parameters j and t as long as they are kept fixed.

Lemma 17. *We have*

$$I_{0,k} = \frac{1}{(k-1)!}\left(k\,\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^{k-1} e^{-k\,\frac{b_j}{t}} \quad \textit{for all} \;\; k \in \mathbb{N}, \;\; \textit{and} \tag{4.17}$$

$$I_{0,k} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\frac{t}{b_j}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k\,(1 + O(1/k)) \qquad \textit{as} \qquad k \to \infty \tag{4.18}$$

for $t > 0$ and with $\psi(z) = z\,e^{1-z}$ the function introduced in (4.2). The error term $O(1/k)$ in (4.18) is independent of t.

Proof. By Cauchy's formula we get

$$I_{0,k} = \frac{1}{(k-1)!}\frac{d^{k-1}}{dz^{k-1}}\,e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\Big|_{z=-1} = \frac{1}{(k-1)!}\left(k\,\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^{k-1} e^{-k\frac{b_j}{t}}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which proves (4.17). The estimate (4.18) then follows with Sterling's formula $k! = (k/e)^k\sqrt{2\pi k}\,(1 + \mathrm{O}(1/k))$ and with $\psi(x) = x\,e^{1-x}$. □

In order to achieve our aim, we have to redo the approximation in the proof of Lemma 17 by the saddle point method. There, most of all, we are interested in the definition of the appropriate integration path for the saddle point method.

For later use we repeat the basic formula of the Laplace method (see, for instance, [**20**, Chapter II, §4] or [**17**, Ch. 2.2.2]): Let functions $g \in C^2([a,b])$ and $h \in C^4([a,b])$ be given with $[a,b] \subset \mathbb{R}$, $a < 0 < b$, $g(0) \neq 0$, $h(0) \neq 0$, $h'(0) = 0$, $h''(0) > 0$, and $h(x) > h(0)$ for all $x \in [a,b] \diagdown \{0\}$. Then the integral

$$I(k) = \int_a^b g(x)\, e^{-kh(x)} dx, \qquad k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.19}$$

has the asymptotic approximation

$$I(k) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{k\, h''(0)}}\, g(0)\, e^{-k\, h(0)}\, (1 + \mathrm{O}(1/k)) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{4.20}$$

In the Laplace method the integration extends by definition over a real interval. For integrals like $I_{0,k}$ with integration in $\mathbb{C}$, the choice of the integration path is of key importance for the application of the saddle point method. If such a path Γ has been found, then formula (4.20) carries over to integration along a path Γ in $\mathbb{C}$ thanks to a real parameterization.

In case of integral (4.16) we choose Γ as the path of steepest descent of the modulus of the integrand. With

$$\varphi_0(z) := \frac{b_j}{t} z - \log(1+z) \tag{4.21}$$

integral (4.16) can be rewritten as

$$I_{0,k} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma e^{k\varphi_0(z)} dz, \tag{4.22}$$

where Γ is still an arbitrary Hankel contour in $\mathbb{C} \backslash (-\infty, -1)$. The function $\log(\cdot)$ in (4.21) is defined in $\mathbb{C} \diagdown \mathbb{R}_-$ in the usual way. From the harmonic landscape of the function $\operatorname{Re}\varphi_0$ in $\mathbb{C}$ it is evident that there exists only one saddle point z_0 of $\operatorname{Re}\varphi_0$, which is a critical point of φ_0, and from

$$\varphi_0'(z_0) = \frac{b_j}{t} - \frac{1}{z+1}\bigg|_{z=z_0} = 0,$$

it follows that this point is given by

$$z_0 = z_{0,j} = \frac{t}{b_j} - 1. \tag{4.23}$$

As integration path for the saddle point method we then get

$$\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_{0,j} : \quad z(u) := \frac{t}{b_j}\, u \cot u - 1 + i\, \frac{t}{b_j}\, u, \quad u \in (-\pi, \pi), \tag{4.24}$$

which is the path of steepest descent of $|e^{k\varphi_0(z)}|$ starting at z_0 for $u = 0$, as will be shown in assertion (ii) in the next lemma. In this lemma we assemble several properties of Γ_0, $z(u)$, and φ_0 that will be needed in the sequel.

Lemma 18. *We have*

(i) $\operatorname{Re}\varphi_0(z) < \operatorname{Re}\varphi_0(z_0)$ *for all* $z \in \Gamma_0 \diagdown \{z_0\}$,

(ii) $\operatorname{Im}\varphi_0(z) = 0$ *for all* $z \in \Gamma_0$,

(iii) $\Gamma_0 \cap \mathbb{R} = \{z_0\}$, *and* Γ_0 *cuts* $\mathbb{R}$ *perpendicularly,*

(iv) Γ_0 *is an analytic Hankel contour in* $\mathbb{C} \backslash (-\infty, -1)$,

(v) $z'(u) = \dfrac{t}{b_j}\left[\cot u - \dfrac{u}{\sin^2 u} + i\right]$ *for* $u \in (-\pi, \pi)$,

(vi) $z'(u) = \frac{t}{b_j}\left[-\frac{2}{3}u + i\right] + O(u^3)$ *for* $u \to 0,\, u \in \mathbb{R}$,

(vii) $(\varphi_0 \circ z)(u) = 1 - \frac{b_j}{t} + \log\frac{b_j}{t} - \frac{1}{2}u^2 + O(u^3)$ *for* $u \to 0,\, u \in \mathbb{R}$,

(viii) $e^{k\varphi_0(z(u))} = \psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k e^{-\frac{1}{2}k\,u^2(1+O(u))}$ *for* $u \to 0,\, u \in \mathbb{R}$,

(ix) $e^{k\varphi_0(z)} = \psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k \left(1 + \frac{k}{2}\left(\frac{z-z_0}{1+z_0}\right)^2 + O(k\,(z-z_0)^3)\right)$

for $z \to z_0,\, z \in \mathbb{C},\, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Most of the nine assertions in the lemma can be verified by straightforward calculations starting from the definitions in (4.21) and (4.24). Assertion (i) follows from assertion (ii) and the fact that z_0 is the only critical point of φ_0. □

Using the Hankel contour Γ_0 as integration path, we now derive an asymptotic approximation of the integral in (4.16) by the saddle point method. As already mentioned earlier, this derivation duplicates the proof of Lemma 17. We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{0,k} &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0} e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)}\frac{dz}{i} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{k\,(\varphi_0\circ z)(u)}\frac{z'(u)}{i}du, \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{k}}e^{k\,(\varphi_0\circ z)(0)}\frac{z'(0)}{i}\,(1+\mathrm{O}(1/k)) \qquad (4.25) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k\frac{t}{b_j}\,(1+\mathrm{O}(1/k)) \qquad \text{as} \qquad k\to\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the first two equalities are immediate consequences of, (4.22) and (4.24). From the assertions (i), (v), and (vi) of Lemma 18 we see that the Laplace method is applicable to the second integral in the first line of (4.25). The third equality in (4.25) then follows from the formulae (4.19) and (4.20) with $h = -\varphi_0 \circ z$ and $g = z'/i$. Notice that because of assertion (vii) in Lemma 18 we have $h''(0) = 1$. The fourth equality is a consequence of the assertions (vi) and (viii) in Lemma 18.

A comparison of the last line in (4.25) with (4.18) shows that the saddle point method approximately gives us the same result as in Lemma 17, where it had been proved by direct calculations together with Sterling's formula.

In the sequel we also need an asymptotic approximation of the absolute integral

$$I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t) = I_{0,k}^{abs} := \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0}\left|e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\right|\frac{|dz|}{|z+1|^k} \quad \text{for} \quad k\to\infty. \tag{4.26}$$

This integral is no longer independent of the integration path. The path $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_{0,j}$ will be chosen since it will also be used for the asymptotic approximation in Lemma 21, further below.

Lemma 19. *We have*

$$I_{0,k}^{abs} = I_{0,k}\,(1+O(1/k)) \quad \textit{as} \quad k\to\infty \tag{4.27}$$

for $j = 1,\dots,n$ and $t > 0$. The error term $O(1/k)$ in (4.27) is independent of t.

Remark 3. *The values of the two integrals $I_{0,k}^{abs}$ and $I_{0,k}$ differ apparently much less than a first look on (4.16) and (4.26) may have suggested. Notice that because of (4.22), (4.16), and assertion (ii) in Lemma 16, we have*

$$I_{0,k}^{abs} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0} e^{k\varphi_0(z)}\,|dz|\,,$$

and a comparison with (4.22) shows that only the non-positivity of the differential $-i\,dz = -i\,z'(u)du,\ u\in[-\pi,\pi]$, distinguishes between $I_{0,k}$ and $I_{0,k}^{abs}$.

Proof. In a first step we assume $t > 0$ to be fixed. From assertion (vi) in Lemma 18 we know that $|z'(0)| = t/b_j$, and consequently, it follows in the same way as in the argumentation in (4.25) with the help of the formulae (4.19) and (4.20) by the saddle point method that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{0,k}^{abs} &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{k\,(\varphi_0\circ z)(u)}\,|z'(u)|\,du \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{k}}e^{k\,(\varphi_0\circ z)(0)}\,|z'(0)|\,(1+\mathrm{O}(1/k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k\,\frac{t}{b_j}\,(1+\mathrm{O}(1/k)) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which, with (4.18) in Lemma 17, proves the estimate (4.27).

It remains to show that the error term in (4.27) is independent of t. From (4.24) and assertion (v) in Lemma 18 we know that $e^{k(b_j/t)\,z(u)} = e^{k\,u\,(\cot u\,+\,i)}e^{-k\,(b_j/t)}$, $(1+z(u))^{-1} = (b_j/t)u^{-1}(\cot u\,+\,i)^{-1}$, and $z'(u) = (t/b_j)(\cot u\,-\,u/\sin^2 u\,+\,i)$, which then implies that for any $t > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0(j,t)}\left|e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}\right|\frac{|dz|}{|z+1|^k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z(u)}\right|\frac{|z'(u)|\,du}{|z(u)+1|^k} \qquad (4.28) \\ &= \left(\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^{k-1}e^{-k\frac{b_j}{t}}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\left|e^{kk\,u\,(\cot u\,+\,i)}\right|\frac{\left|\cot u\,-\,u/\sin^2 u\,+\,i\right|du}{|u\,(\cot u\,+\,i)|^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the integral in the third line of (4.28) is independent of t, a comparison with (4.17) shows that in (4.27) the error term is independent of t. In the first line of (4.28) we have used the notation $\Gamma_0(j,t)$ in order to underline the dependence of the curve Γ_0 on j and t. □

The last piece in our investigation of integral (4.16) is concerned with estimates of integral (4.26) over certain small arcs in a neighborhood of z_0. We need these results only for the case that $|t-b_j|$ is small, which, because of (4.23), means that z_0 lies near the origin.

Lemma 20. *We assume $|t-b_j| \le b_j k^{-\alpha}$ for some $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$ and set $\Delta_k^\alpha := k^{-\alpha}\mathbb{D}$. Then we have*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0\cap\Delta_k^\alpha}\left|e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)}\right||dz| = O(k^{-\alpha}) = I_{0,k}^{abs}\;O(k^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}) \quad as \quad k\to\infty, \qquad (4.29)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{\partial\Delta_k^\alpha}\left|e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)}\right||dz| = O(k^{-\alpha}) = I_{0,k}^{abs}\;O(k^{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha}) \quad as \quad k\to\infty. \qquad (4.30)$$

The error terms $O(\,\cdot\,)$ in (4.29) and (4.30) are independent of t.

Proof. From the assumption $|z_0| = |1-t/b_j| \le k^{-\alpha}$, from the estimate (4.27) in Lemma 19, from (4.18) in Lemma 17, and from the definition of ψ in (4.2), we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_{0,k}^{abs} &= I_{0,k}\left(1+\mathrm{O}(\frac{1}{k})\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha})\right) \qquad (4.31) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\alpha})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t}) &= \left(1-(1-\frac{b_j}{t})\right)e^{1-\frac{b_j}{t}} \qquad (4.32)\\ &= 1+\mathrm{O}((1-\frac{b_j}{t})^2) = 1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-2\alpha}) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

(i) If the function $u_1(k)$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$, is implicitly defined by

$$\Gamma_0\cap\Delta_k^\alpha = \{\, z(u)\,|\, -u_1(k)\le u\le u_1(k)\,\},$$

then from (4.24) and assertion (vi) in Lemma 18 we deduce that

$$0\;\le\; u_1(k)\;\le\; k^{-\alpha}(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha})) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty.$$

With the assertions (i), (ii), (vi), and (viii) in Lemma 18, with the first line in (4.25), and with (4.32), we then further deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0\cap\Delta_k^\alpha}\left|e^{k\varphi_0(z)}\right||dz| \;&\le\; \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-k^{-\alpha}(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha}))}^{k^{-\alpha}(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha}))} e^{k\,(\varphi_0\circ z)(u)}\,|z'(u)|\,du\\ &\le\; \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{k\varphi_0(z_0)}(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha}))2k^{-\alpha}(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha})) \qquad (4.33)\\ &=\; \frac{k^{-\alpha}}{\pi}e^{k\varphi_0(z_0)}(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\alpha}))(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha}))\\ &=\; \mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha}) \quad \text{as} \;\; k\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

With (4.31) and (4.33) we have proved (4.29). All error terms $\mathrm{O}(\,\cdot\,)$ hold uniformly for t with $|t-b_j|\le b_jk^{-\alpha}$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

(ii) Because of $|z_0|\le k^{-\alpha}$, we have

$$\frac{k}{2}\left(\frac{z-z_0}{1+z_0}\right)^2 \;=\; \mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\,\alpha}) \;\; \text{uniformly for} \;\; z\in\partial\Delta_k^\alpha.$$

From assertion (ix) in Lemma 18 and (4.32) we therefore deduce that

$$\left|e^{k\varphi_0(z)}\right| \le (1+\mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\,\alpha}))(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\,\alpha})) = 1+\mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\,\alpha})$$

uniformly for $z\in\partial\Delta_k^\alpha$ as $k\to\infty$. This estimate yields

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_{\partial\Delta_k^\alpha}\left|e^{k\varphi_0(z)}\right||dz| \le k^{-\alpha}\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{1-2\,\alpha})\right) = \mathrm{O}(k^{-\alpha}) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty,$$

which together with (4.31) then proves (4.30). Again, all error terms $\mathrm{O}(\,\cdot\,)$ hold uniformly for t with $|t-b_j|\le b_jk^{-\alpha}$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$. □

4.4. Completion of the Proof of Propositions 2.

The next lemma is the core piece of the proof of Propositions 2, and its proof will fill the greater part of the present subsection.

Lemma 21. *For the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$, $j=1,\ldots,n$, $t>0$, from (4.14) we have the asymptotic approximation*

$$\begin{aligned}I_{1,k}(j,t) \;=\; \left(1+O(k^{-1/4})\right)\Bigg[&\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}}\frac{t}{b_j}\psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k - \qquad (4.34)\\ &-\chi_{(0,b_j)}(t)\frac{t^2}{k\,b_j}e^{-a_{jj}}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta\Bigg] \quad \textit{as} \quad k\to\infty\end{aligned}$$

with $\chi_{(0,b_j)}$ the characteristic function of $(0,b_j)$, and with the objects C_j and λ_j being the same as in Proposition 2. The error term $O(k^{-1/4})$ holds uniformly for all $t>0$.

Lemma 21 together with (4.13) provides a fast path to the proof of Proposition 2.

Proof of Proposition 2. Inserting (4.34) into (4.13) yields

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = (-1)^k \left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) \left[k!\left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^k \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}} e^{a_{jj}}\, \psi(\frac{b_j}{t})^k - \right.$$
$$\left. - k!\left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \sum_{t<b_j} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta} d\zeta \right] \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty.$$

Hence, Proposition 2 is proved as soon we have completed the proof of Lemma 21. □

The proof of Lemma 21 starts with a comparison of the two integrals $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ and $I_{0,k}(j,t)$ from (4.14) and (4.26), where in $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ we take Γ_0 from (4.24) as integration path. With (4.14), (4.26), (4.21), and assertion (ii) in Lemma 18 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,k}-I_{0,k}| &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\left| \int_{\Gamma_0} e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}(1+z)^{-k} \left[\left(1+\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right)^{-k} - 1\right] dz \right| \\ &\le \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0} e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)} \left| \left(1+\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right)^{-k} - 1\right| |dz|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

This estimate illustrates the importance of the difference in the integral in the second line of (4.35). The function r_{jk} has been introduced in (4.12). An estimate of this difference is a topic in the next lemma, where we also prove some results that are important for answering questions about the admissibility of Γ_0 as an integration path in $I_{1,k}(j,t)$.

Lemma 22. *Like in Lemma 20 we set $\Delta_k^\alpha := k^{-\alpha}\mathbb{D}$ and assume that $\frac{1}{2}<\alpha<1$. For each $\alpha\in(1/2,1)$ there exists $k_\alpha\in\mathbb{N}$ such that the following three assertions holds true.*

(i) *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_k^\alpha \subset \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0) \quad \text{for} \quad t\ge b_j(1+k^{-\alpha}), \\ &\Delta_k^\alpha \cap \Gamma_0 \ne \varnothing \quad \text{for} \quad |t-b_j|<b_jk^{-\alpha}, \\ &\Delta_k^\alpha \subset \mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0) \quad \text{for} \quad 0<t\le b_j(1-k^{-\alpha}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

and for $j=1,\dots,n$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

(ii) *The expression $1+z+r_{jk}(z)$ in integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ from (4.14) with r_{jk} from (4.12) is analytic and different from zero on the closure of $\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha$ for all $k\ge k_\alpha$, $j=1,\dots,n$, and $t>0$.*

(iii) *We have*

$$\left(1+\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right)^{-k} = 1 + O(k^{\alpha-1}) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty \tag{4.37}$$

for $j=1,\dots,n$ and uniformly for

$$\begin{aligned} &z\in\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)} \quad \text{if} \quad t\ge b_j(1+k^{-\alpha}), \\ &z\in\partial\Delta_k^\alpha\cup\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha \quad \text{if} \quad |t-b_j|<b_jk^{-\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \\ &z\in\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha \quad \text{if} \quad 0<t\le b_j(1-k^{-\alpha}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Remark 4. *Because of the first line in (4.36), assertion (ii) holds also on* $\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}$ *for* $t \geq b_j(1+k^{-\alpha})$ *and* $k \geq k_\alpha$.

Proof. From (4.24) and

$$|1+z(u)| \,=\, \frac{t}{b_j}\frac{u}{\sin u}\,|\cos u + i\,\sin u| \,\geq\, \frac{t}{b_j} \quad \text{for} \quad u \in (-\pi,\pi)$$

we deduce that $|1+z| \,\geq\, t/b_j$ for $z \in \Gamma_0$, which implies that

$$|1+z| \,\geq\, \frac{t}{b_j} \quad \text{for all} \quad z \in \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}. \tag{4.39}$$

(i) Each line of (4.36) will be proved separately. In the proof of the first line we assume that

$$t \,\geq\, b_j(1+k^{-\alpha}), \tag{4.40}$$

which implies with (4.39) that

$$|z| \,\geq\, \frac{t}{b_j} - 1 \,\geq\, (1+k^{-\alpha}) - 1 \,=\, k^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \Gamma_0,$$

and consequently we have

$$\Delta_k^\alpha \,\subset\, \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0) \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Next, we assume that

$$0 \,<\, t \,\leq\, b_j(1-k^{-\alpha}). \tag{4.41}$$

Then by (4.23) we have

$$x_0 \,=\, \frac{t}{b_j} - 1 \,\leq\, (1-k^{-\alpha}) - 1 \,=\, -k^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for} \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

From assertion (iii) in Lemma 18 and the convexity of $\mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0)$, we then conclude that

$$\Delta_k^\alpha \,\subset\, \mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0) \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which proves the third line in (4.36).

At last, we assume that

$$|t - b_j| < b_j k^{-\alpha}. \tag{4.42}$$

With (4.23) we then have

$$|x_0| \,=\, \left|\frac{t}{b_j} - 1\right| \,<\, k^{-\alpha},$$

which shows that $x_0 \in \Delta_k^\alpha$. With assertion (iii) from Lemma 18 it follows that

$$\Delta_k^\alpha \cap \Gamma_0 \,\neq\, \varnothing \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and consequently the second line of (4.36) has been proved.

(ii) In the present subsection we will prove only the analyticity statement in assertion (ii), while the proof of the absence of zeros will follow as a by-product of the investigations in subsection (iii). In the proof of assertion (ii) and (iii), Lemma 16 is of key importance. We set

$$k_R \,:=\, (2\,b_n R)^{1/1-\alpha} \tag{4.43}$$

with the constant $R > 0$ from Lemma 16. The proof of assertion (ii) is split into two parts; in the first one we assume (4.40) and show that

$$\frac{R\,t}{k}\mathbb{D} \,\subset\, \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0) \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq k_R. \tag{4.44}$$

From (4.44) and assertion (i) in Lemma 16 we then conclude that the analyticity statement in assertion (ii) is proved.

In order to prove (4.44) we observe that because of (4.39) and assumption (4.40) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |z| \;\ge\; \frac{t}{b_j} - 1 \;=\; \frac{t}{b_j}(1 - \frac{b_j}{t}) \;\ge\; \frac{t}{b_j}(1 - \frac{1}{1+k^{-\alpha}}) \\ =\; \frac{t}{b_j}\frac{k^{-\alpha}}{1+k^{-\alpha}} \;\ge\; \frac{t}{2\,b_j}k^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \Gamma_0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

which further yields

$$\frac{k}{t}\,|z| \;\ge\; \frac{k^{1-\alpha}}{2\,b_j} \;\ge\; \frac{k_R^{1-\alpha}}{2\,b_j} \;=\; \frac{b_n}{b_j}R \;\ge\; R \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \Gamma_0, \;\; k \ge k_R,$$

and these last equalities prove (4.44).

Next, we assume that

$$0 \;<\; t \;<\; b_j(1 + k^{-\alpha}), \tag{4.46}$$

and show that

$$\frac{R\,t}{k}\mathbb{D} \;\subset\; \Delta_k^\alpha \quad \text{for} \quad k \ge k_R \tag{4.47}$$

with the constant $R > 0$ from Lemma 16. The analyticity statement in assertion (ii) then follows from (4.47) and assertion (i) in Lemma 16 for the case $0 \;<\; t \;<\; b_j(1 + k^{-\alpha})$.

Inclusion (4.47) follows from the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R\,t}{k} \;<\; Rb_j\frac{1}{k}(1 + k^{-\alpha}) \;\le\; R\,2b_jk^{-1} \;\le\; R\,2b_jk_R^{\alpha-1}k^{-\alpha} \\ \le\; \frac{b_j}{b_n}k^{-\alpha} \;\le\; k^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for} \;\; k \ge k_R. \end{aligned}$$

The penultimate inequality is a consequence of (4.43).

(iii) The proof of assertion (iii) is split into three parts that correspond to the three conditions in (4.38). In the first part we assume (4.40). From (4.44) we know that (4.15) in Lemma 16 holds true, and we get

$$|r_{jk}(z)| \;\le\; c_0\frac{t^2}{k^2\,|z|} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)} \;\; \text{and} \;\; k \ge k_R. \tag{4.48}$$

With (4.39), (4.48), and (4.45), we then deduce that

$$\left|\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right| \;\le\; c_0 2\,b_j^2\,k^{\alpha-2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)} \;\; \text{and} \;\; k \ge k_R. \tag{4.49}$$

Estimate (4.37) then follows from (4.49) for the case that $t \;\ge\; b_j(1 + k^{-\alpha})$. If we choose $k_\alpha \ge k_R$ sufficiently large, then it follows from (4.49) that the expression $1 + z + r_{jk}(z)$ has no zero in $\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}$, which completes the proof of assertion (ii) for the case of $t \;\ge\; b_j(1 + k^{-\alpha})$.

Next, we assume (4.41). Because of the inclusion proved in (4.47) we see that (4.15) in Lemma 16 holds true, which implies that

$$|r_{jk}(z)| \;\le\; c_0\frac{t^2}{k^2\,|z|} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{C}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha \;\; \text{and} \;\; k \ge k_R. \tag{4.50}$$

Since $|z| \;\ge\; k^{-\alpha}$ on $\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha$, we deduce from the last estimate together with (4.39) that

$$\left|\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right| \;\le\; c_0 2\,b_j^2\,k^{\alpha-2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha \;\; \text{and} \;\; k \ge k_R, \tag{4.51}$$

which is identical with (4.49). This last inequality proves (4.37) uniformly for $z \;\in\; \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha$ and $0 < t \le b_j(1 - k^{-\alpha})$, i.e., for the conditions in the last line of (4.38). Further, it follows from (4.51) that the expression $1 + z + r_{jk}(z)$ has no zeros in $\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha$ for $0 < t \le b_j(1-k^{-\alpha})$ and $k \ge k_\alpha$ with $k_\alpha \ge k_R$ chosen sufficiently large.

At last we assume (4.42). As before we deduce from (4.47), (4.15) in Lemma 16, and (4.39) that (4.51) holds under assumption (4.42).

From (4.50), (4.42), and (4.47) we further deduced that

$$\left|\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right| \le c_0 \frac{t^2}{k^2\,|z\,(1+z)|} \le c_0 4\, b_j^2\, k^{\alpha-2} \text{ for } z \in \partial\Delta_k^\alpha \text{ and } k \ge k_R.$$

Together with (4.51) the last estimate proves (4.37) uniformly for $z \in \partial\Delta_k^\alpha \cup \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^\alpha$ and $|t-b_j| \le b_j k^{-\alpha}$, i.e., for the conditions in the second line of (4.38).

The absence of zeros in the expression $1+z+r_{jk}(z)$ follows under assumption (4.42) in an analogous way as it has been proved before under assumption (4.41).

$\square$

In the remainder of the present subsection we take $\alpha = 3/4$ to be fixed, and prove Lemma 21, which will be done separately in the following four cases

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(a):} \quad t \ge b_j(1+k^{-3/4}), \\ &\text{(b):} \quad b_j \le t < b_j(1+k^{-3/4}), \\ &\text{(c):} \quad 0 < t \le b_j(1-k^{-3/4}), \\ &\text{(d):} \quad b_j(1-k^{-3/4}) < t < b_j \end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

with $k = k_0, k_0+1, \ldots$, where $k_0 := k_{3/4}$ has been taken from Lemma 22. The four cases in (4.52) are oriented on the three different cases listed in (4.36) and (4.38). Their ordering has been determined by considerations of the technical needs in the proof. The division into four parts has become necessary since the Hankel contour Γ_0 from (4.24) is admissible as integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ from (4.14) only in case (a). The three other cases demand modifications and also additions to the curve Γ_0.

Case (a): We assume that the condition stated in the first line of (4.52) holds true. From this condition together with (4.23), assertion (iii) in Lemma 18, the first line in (4.36), and assertion (ii) in Lemma 22, we deduce that the integrand of $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ in (4.14) is analytic on $\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}$. Therefore, Γ_0 is admissible as integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$.

From (4.35) together with assertion (ii) in Lemma 18 and estimate (4.37) in Lemma 22, which holds uniformly on $\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}$ under the assumption $t \ge b_j(1+k^{-\alpha})$, we then get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,k}(j,t) - I_{0,k}(j,t)| &\le \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_0} e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)} \left| \left(1+\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right)^{-k} - 1\right| |dz| \\ &= I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t)\,\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4}) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{4.53}$$

and therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,k}(j,t) &= I_{0,k}(j,t) + I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t)\,\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4}) \\ &= I_{0,k}(j,t)\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty \end{aligned} \tag{4.54}$$

uniformly for $t \ge b_j(1+k^{-3/4})$, $j = 1,\ldots,n$. With (4.18) in Lemma 17, (4.54) proves Lemma 21 for case (a).

Case (b): We assume that the condition stated in the second line of (4.52) holds true. Under this condition we learn from (4.23) and assertion (iii) in Lemma

18 that Γ_0 comes arbitrarily close to the origin, and therefore it it is not guaranteed that all singularities of the function r_{jk} from (4.12) are contained in $\mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0)$. Hence, Γ_0 is no longer admissible as integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ from (4.14), as it was in case (a). Instead,we take the modified path

$$\Gamma_{1,k} := (\Gamma_0 \diagdown \Delta_k^{-3/4}) \cup (\partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} \diagdown \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0)) \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq k_0. \tag{4.55}$$

Like in case of Γ_0, we assume an orientation such that $\mathbb{R}_-$ is encircled counter clockwise. The set $\Delta_k^{-3/4}$ in (4.55) has been introduced in Lemma 22, and k_0 has been introduced after (4.52) as $k_0 = k_{3/4}$. We shall see that the curve $\Gamma_{1,k}$ stays far enough away from the origin so that its admissibility in $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ can be guaranteed. On the other hand, it is not so different from Γ_0 that the difference (4.53) can no longer be guaranteed to be asymptotically sufficiently small.

It is not difficult to see that $\Gamma_{1,k} = \partial\left(\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)\diagdown\Delta_k^{-3/4}\right)$, and therefore the admissibility of $\Gamma_{1,k}$ follows from assertion (ii) in Lemma 22.

Obviously, $\Gamma_{1,k}$ is also admissible for the integral $I_{0,k}(j,t)$ from (4.16), i.e., we have

$$I_{0,k}(j,t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\Gamma_{1,k}} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}dz}{(z+1)^k} \quad \text{for all} \quad k \geq k_0.$$

In case of the absolute integral $I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t)$ in (4.26), where we have no path-independence, the situation demands some care. Using the estimates from Lemma 20 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{1,k}} \left|\frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}}{(z+1)^k}\right| |dz| &= \qquad\qquad (4.56) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(\int_{\Gamma_0}\cdots \; - \int_{\Gamma_0\cap\Delta_k^{-3/4}}\cdots \; + \int_{\partial\Delta_k^{-3/4}\diagdown\,\mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0)}\cdots\right) \\ &= I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t)\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the substitution of Γ_0 by $\Gamma_{1,k}$ in (4.26) causes changes of order at most $I_{0,k}^{abs}\,\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})$.

As in (4.53), we now consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{1,k}(j,t) - I_{0,k}(j,t)| &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\left|\int_{\Gamma_{1,k}} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}dz}{(z+1+r_{jk}(z))^k} - \int_{\Gamma_{1,k}}\frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}dz}{(z+1)^k}\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{1,k}} \left|e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)}\right| \left|\left(1+\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right)^{-k} - 1\right| |dz| \qquad (4.57) \\ &\leq \sup_{z\in\Gamma_{1,k}} \left|\left(1+\frac{r_{jk}(z)}{1+z}\right)^{-k} - 1\right| \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\Gamma_{1,k}} \left|e^{k\,\varphi_0(z)}\right| |dz| \\ &= I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t)\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-3/4})\right)\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4}) = I_{0,k}^{abs}\,\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4}) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The decisive step in (4.57) is the transition from the penultimate line to the last one, which follows from (4.37) in Lemma 22 and from (4.56). Notice that $\Gamma_{1,k} = \partial\left(\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)\diagdown\Delta_k^{-3/4}\right)$. From the second line of (4.38) in Lemma 22 we know that the estimate in (4.37), and therefore also the estimate in (4.57), holds uniformly for $b_j \leq t < b_j(1+k^{-3/4})$ and $j = 1,\ldots,n$.

Analogous to case (a), we deduce (4.54) from (4.57) uniformly for $b_j \leq t < b_j(1+k^{-3/4})$, $j = 1,\ldots,n$. With (4.18) in Lemma 17 this then proves Lemma 21 for case (b).

Case (c): We assume that the condition stated in the third line of (4.52) holds true. Under this condition the curve Γ_0 from (4.24) cuts $\mathbb{R}$ in the interval $(-1, 0)$, and consequently it is not admissible as integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j, t)$ of (4.14). Instead, we now use

$$\Gamma_{2,k} := \Gamma_0 \cup \partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} = \Gamma_0 \cup C_0 \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq k_0, \tag{4.58}$$

as integration path. Because of (4.23) and assertion (iii) in Lemma 18, $\Gamma_{2,k}$ consists of the two disjoint components Γ_0 and $C_0 = \partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} = k^{-3/4}\partial\mathbb{D}$. For Γ_0 we keep the orientation introduced in (4.24), and C_0 is assumed to be oriented counter clockwise. Under the assumption $0 < t \leq b_j(1 - k^{-3/4})$ in the present case, we have $\Gamma_{2,k} = \partial\left(\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)}\diagdown\Delta_k^{-3/4}\right)$, and therefore it follows from assertion (ii) in Lemma 22 that $\Gamma_{2,k}$ is admissible as integration path in the integral $I_{1,k}(j, t)$ for $k \geq k_0$. We introduce the two integrals $I_{2,k}(j, t)$ and $I_{3,k}(j, t)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,k}(j,t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(\int_{\Gamma_0} \cdots \quad + \oint\limits_{C_0} \frac{e^{k\frac{b_j}{t}z}dz}{(z+1+r_{jk}(z))^k}\right) \\ &= I_{2,k}(j,t) \,+\, I_{3,k}(j,t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.59}$$

and investigate both of them separately. We start with integral $I_{2,k}(j, t)$.

Exactly, like in (4.53), we derive the estimate

$$|I_{2,k}(j,t) - I_{0,k}(j,t)| \,\leq\, I_{0,k}^{abs}(j,t)\,\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4}) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty$$

with the help of estimate (4.37) in Lemma 22, which, because of the third line in (4.38), holds also in the present case. From this estimate we then get

$$I_{2,k}(j,t) = I_{0,k}(j,t)\left(1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) \qquad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty \tag{4.60}$$

like in (4.54). This last estimate holds uniformly for $0 < t \leq b_j(1 - k^{-3/4})$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

Next, we derive an asymptotic approximation of $I_{3,k}(j, t)$ for $k \to \infty$. In a first step we redo the variable transformation (4.10) by the substitution

$$z \,=\, \frac{t}{k\,b_j}\,(\zeta - a_{jj})\,. \tag{4.61}$$

From the definition of r_{jk} in (4.12) we get

$$1 + z + r_{jk}(z) \,=\, 1 \,-\, \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(k\frac{b_j}{t}z + a_{jj}) \,=\, 1 \,-\, \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(\zeta).$$

The integration path C_0 transforms into

$$C_{1,k} \,:=\, (\frac{b_j}{t}k^{1/4})\,\partial\mathbb{D} + a_{jj},$$

and the choice of the constant $R > 0$ in Lemma 16 can be assumed to be so large that all functions τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are analytic in $\{\,|\zeta| > R - |a_{jj}| - 1\,\}$ for $k \geq k_0$. Consequently, $\{\,|\zeta| = R\,\}$ is an integration path equivalent (homolog) to $C_{1,k}$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$ and $k \geq k_0$. From the definition of $I_{3,k}(j, t)$ in (4.59) and from (4.14), we then have

$$I_{3,k}(j,t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\,\frac{t\,e^{-a_{jj}}}{k\,b_j} \oint\limits_{|\zeta|=R} \frac{e^{\zeta}\,d\zeta}{(1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(\zeta))^k} \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq k_0.$$

Since all functions τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are bounded on $\{\,|\zeta| = R\,\}$, we have

$$(1 - \frac{t}{k}\tau_j(\zeta))^{-k} = e^{t\,\tau_j(\zeta)}\,\left(1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})\right) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty$$

uniformly for $|\zeta| = R$, $0 < t \leq b_j(1 - k^{-3/4})$, and $j = 1, \ldots, n$, which yields

$$I_{3,k}(j,t) = \frac{1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i} \frac{t\, e^{-a_{jj}}}{k\, b_j} \oint\limits_{|\zeta|=R} e^{\zeta + t\, \tau_j(\zeta)}\, d\zeta \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{4.62}$$

The error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})$ holds uniformly for $0 < t \leq b_j(1 - k^{-3/4})$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

We need a further transformation of the integral $I_{3,k}(j,t)$. It can be assumed that the constant $R > 0$ in Lemma 16 is chosen so large that from Lemma 12 we can deduce that all τ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, are invertible for $|\zeta| > R - 1$, and from (3.38) in Lemma 12 we then know that $\tau_j(\zeta) = \lambda_j^{-1}(\zeta)$ for $|\zeta| > R - 1$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$. We transform $I_{3,k}(j,t)$ by the variable substitution $\zeta = \lambda_j(u) = \tau_j^{-1}(u)$. The new integration path C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is defined as

$$C_j := \tau_j(R\, \partial\mathbb{D}), \quad j = 1, \ldots, n.$$

From (4.62) we then get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{3,k}(j,t) &= \frac{1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i} \frac{t\, e^{-a_{jj}}}{k\, b_j} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(u) + t\, u} \lambda_j'(u) du \\ &= \frac{1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i} \frac{t\, e^{-a_{jj}}}{k\, b_j} \left[\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(u) + t\, u} (\lambda_j'(u) + t)\, du \;-\; t \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(u) + t\, u} du \right] \\ &= \frac{-1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i} \frac{t^2}{k\, b_j} e^{-a_{jj}} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(u) + t\, u} du \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

Integration by parts shows that the first integral in the second line of (4.63) is identical zero. The error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})$ in (4.63) holds uniformly for $0 < t \leq b_j(1 - k^{-3/4})$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

The two estimates (4.60) and (4.63) together with (4.59) and (4.18) in Lemma 17 prove Lemma 21 for case (c).

Case (d): We assume that the condition stated in the fourth line of (4.52) holds true. Under this condition the proof of Lemma 21 practically is a combination of the strategies applied in case (b) and case (c). As integration path for $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ we now take

$$\Gamma_{3,k} := \left[(\Gamma_0 \diagdown \Delta_k^{-3/4}) \cup (\partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} \cap \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0)) \right] \cup \partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} = \Gamma_{4,k} \cup C_0 \tag{4.64}$$

for $k \geq k_0$, where $\Gamma_{4,k} = (\Gamma_0 \diagdown \Delta_k^{-3/4}) \cup (\partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} \cap \mathrm{Int}(\Gamma_0))$ has the same orientation as Γ_0 with the necessary completion on the modifications close to the origin, $\Gamma_{4,k}$ cuts $\mathbb{R}$ in $(-1, 0)$, and the second curve $C_0 = \partial\Delta_k^{-3/4}$ is oriented counter clockwise. Contrary to case (c), the two curves $\Gamma_{4,k}$ and C_0 are now no longer disjoint.

Obviously, the integration path $\Gamma_{3,k}$ is equivalent to

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{3,k} := (\Gamma_0 \diagdown \Delta_k^{-3/4}) \cup (\partial\Delta_k^{-3/4} \cap \mathrm{Ext}(\Gamma_0)).$$

The curve $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{3,k}$ has the same structure as $\Gamma_{1,k}$ in (4.55), and therefore it is possible to derive with the same argumentation as applied there that $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{3,k}$ is admissible for the integral $I_{1,k}(j,t)$ under the condition of the present case. Consequently, also $\Gamma_{3,k}$ in (4.64) is admissible for $I_{1,k}(j,t)$.

Like in case (c), the two integrals $I_{4,k}(j,t)$ and $I_{5,k}(j,t)$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,k}(j,t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\Gamma_{4,k}} \cdots \; + \oint_{C_0} \frac{e^{k \frac{b_j}{t} z} dz}{(z + 1 + r_{jk}(z))^k} \right) \\ &= I_{4,k}(j,t) \,+\, I_{5,k}(j,t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.65}$$

and they will be analyzed separately.

The asymptotic analysis of the integral $I_{4,k}(j,t)$ for $k \to \infty$ practically is a duplication of the analysis done in case (b). Because of the second line in (4.38), Lemma 22 is applicable also now, and therefore all steps in the analysis of case (b) can be repeated. Analogously to the conclusion made after (4.57), we deduce that

$$I_{4,k}(j,t) \;=\; I_{0,k}(j,t)\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) \qquad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty \tag{4.66}$$

uniformly for $b_j(1-k^{-3/4}) \,<\, t \,<\, b_j$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

The asymptotic approximation of the integral $I_{5,k}(j,t)$ in (4.65) for $k \to \infty$ is done in exactly the same way as the approximation of $I_{3,k}(j,t)$ for $k \to \infty$ in case (c). Starting point for the procedure is the variable transformation (4.61); all subsequent steps from (4.61) until (4.63) are then repeated in an identical manner such that at the end we get the estimate

$$I_{5,k}(j,t) \;=\; \frac{-1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})}{2\pi i}\,\frac{t^2}{k\,b_j}e^{-a_{jj}}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(u)+t\,u}du \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty \tag{4.67}$$

uniformly for $b_j(1-k^{-3/4}) < t < b_j$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$, which is the analog to (4.63).

The two estimates (4.66) and (4.67) together with (4.65) and (4.18) in Lemma 17 prove Lemma 21 for case (d).

With the four cases (a) - (d) we have completed the proof of Lemma 21. At the beginning of the present subsection, immediately after the statement of Lemma 21 in the proof of Proposition 2, it has already been mentioned that a completion of the proof of Lemma 21 also completes the proof of Proposition 2, and so the principal task of the present section has been brought to a close.

5. Inversion of the Laplace Transform

In the present section we shall use the Post-Widder inversion formula for two purposes: Firstly, we shall prove the existence of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2), and secondly, we shall verify the representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2. Starting point of the analysis is the asymptotic approximation of $f^{(k)}(k/t)$ for $k \to \infty$ in Proposition 2 in last section.

5.1. The Post-Widder Inversion Formula.

For easier reference at later places, we first assemble several results related to the Post-Widder inversion formula for Laplace transforms. For general reference we use the book [**19**] by David V. Widder.

Definition 5. *For $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ we define the operator $L_{t,k}$ by*

$$L_{t,k}(F) := \frac{(-1)^k}{k!}\left(\frac{k}{t}\right)^{k+1} F^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) \quad \textit{for} \quad t \geq 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.1}$$

This operator is a core piece in all results connected with the Post-Widder inversion formula.

We start our compilation with two theorems, in the first one the existence problem is addressed, while in the same one we give a version of the Post-Widder inversion formula that is general enough for our needs.

Theorem 3. *(cf.* [**19**, Ch.VII, Theorem 12a]*) For $F \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ the existence of a (possibly signed or complex-valued) measure μ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ of bounded variation with*

$$F(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\,s}d\mu(s) \tag{5.2}$$

is equivalent to the existence of a constant $M < \infty$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty |L_{t,k}(F)|\,dt \;\le\; M \quad \textit{for each} \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \tag{5.3}$$

We have $\|\mu\| \le M$.

Theorem 4. *(cf.* [**19**, Ch.VII, Theorem 7a]*) If F is given by (5.2) with a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ of bounded variation, then we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^t L_{u,k}(F)du \;=\; \mu\left((0,t)\right) + \frac{1}{2}\mu\left(\{t\}\right) \quad \textit{for each} \quad t > 0, \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} F(t) \;=\; \mu\left(\{0\}\right). \tag{5.5}$$

In Theorem 7a of [**19**, Chapter VII] it has been assumed in addition to the assumptions made in Theorem 4 that the abscissa of convergence of the Laplace transform (5.2) is finite. But this assumption is already a consequence of our somewhat stronger assumption that the measure μ is of bounded variation (cf. [**19**, Ch.II, Theorem 2.1]).

In our investigations the absolutely continuous and the discrete component of the measure μ in (5.2) are of special interest. Their recovery is addressed in the next two propositions, which are special cases of Theorem 4.

Proposition 3. *(cf.* [**19**, Ch.VII, Theorem 6a]*) Let the same assumptions hold as in Theorem 4, and assume in addition that μ is absolutely continues with a density function μ'. Then we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} L_{t,k}(F) \;=\; \mu'(t) \tag{5.6}$$

for every Lebesgue point $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ of the density function μ'.

Proposition 4. *(cf.* [**19**, Ch.VII, Theorem 9]*) Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 4 we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} (-1)^k \left(\frac{e}{t}\right)^k F^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) \;=\; \mu\left(\{t\}\right) \quad \textit{for} \quad t > 0, \tag{5.7}$$

and $\lim_{t\to\infty} F(t) \;=\; \mu\left(\{0\}\right)$.

5.2. Existence of the Measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2).

In the present subsection we address the existence problem for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2).

Proposition 5. *There exists a measure $\mu_{A,B}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ of bonded variation such that for the function f from (1.1) we have $f = \mathcal{L}(\mu_{A,B})$, i.e., the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ satisfies (1.2).*

Remark 5. *At the present stage of analysis it cannot be excluded that $\mu_{A,B}$ is a signed measure.*

Remark 6. *It has already been mentioned earlier in the preview of the present section (cf., Subsection 1.5.4) that the existence of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in (1.2) had already been proved in* [**14**] *and* [**15**] *by a different method. The inclusion of a new existence proof in the present investigation has been done in the interest of a methodological homogeneity of the investigations.*

PROOF. The proof of Proposition 5 is based on Theorem 3, i.e., we shall show that there exists a constant $M < \infty$ such that condition (5.3) is satisfied.

From (5.1) in Definition 5 and from (4.1) in Proposition 2 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t,k}(f) \,=\, & \frac{(-1)^k}{k!}\left(\frac{k}{t}\right)^{k+1} f^{(k)}\!\left(\frac{k}{t}\right) \,= \\ & \left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right)\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_{jj}}\sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\,\psi\!\left(\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^{k}\frac{1}{t} \,-\, \sum_{t<b_j}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta\right] \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

for $k \to \infty$, $t > 0$, and the error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})$ holds uniformly for all $t > 0$. Because of this uniformity, there exists $M_0 < \infty$ with

$$1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4}) \,\le\, M_0 \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{5.9}$$

The functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, in (5.8) have been introduced in Definition 2, and as it has been assumed in Proposition 2, each integration path C_j in (5.8) is a positively oriented Jordan curve with the property that the corresponding function λ_j is analytic on C_j and in its exterior. We introduce the two integrals

$$I_{1,k,j} \,:=\, \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\int_0^\infty \psi\!\left(\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^k \frac{dt}{t}, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, j = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{5.10}$$

$$I_{2,k} := \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^\infty \left|\sum_{t<b_j}\oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta\right| dt, \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, \tag{5.11}$$

and deduced from (5.8) and (5.9) that

$$\int_0^\infty |L_{t,k}(F)|\,dt \,\le\, M_0\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_{jj}} I_{1,k,j} \,+\, I_{2,k}\right] \quad \text{for} \;\; k = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{5.12}$$

For the integral $I_{1,k,j}$ we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1,k,j} \,&=\, \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\int_0^\infty \psi\!\left(\frac{b_j}{t}\right)^k \frac{dt}{t} \,=\, \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\int_0^\infty \psi(u)^k \frac{du}{u} \\ &=\, \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\int_0^\infty e^{k\,h(u)}du \,=\, \sqrt{\frac{k}{2\pi}}\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{k\,h''(1)}}e^{k\,h(1)}\left(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1})\right) \\ &=\, 1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1}) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty,\; j = 1, \ldots, n, \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

with $h(u)$ an abbreviation for the function $-\log\psi(u)$. Indeed, in (5.13) the second equality follows from a variable transformation $u = b_j/t$, the third one from partial integration and $\psi(u) = u\,e^{1-u}$, the fourth one follows from the Laplace method as stated in (4.1) and (4.20), where we now have taken $a = 0$, $b = \infty$, and the role of $x = 0$ is played by $u = 1$. We have $h(1) = 0$ and $h''(1) = 1$, which then verifies the last equality in (5.13). From (5.13) it follows that there exists $M_1 < \infty$ such that

$$I_{1,k,j} \,\le\, M_1 \;\; \text{for all} \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, \;\; \text{and}\; j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{5.14}$$

Next, we derive an estimate for the integrals $I_{2,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. From assertion (iii) in Lemma 6 in Section 3 we know that all n functions $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ are analytic in a punctured neighborhood of infinity. Therefore, we can choose all integration paths $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ in (5.11) to be identical to a single smooth Jordan curve C with the property that the functions $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ are analytic on and outside of C. From Lemma 15 in Section 4 it follows that

$$\oint_C \sum_{t<b_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta \,=\, 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \le t < b_1 \;\; \text{and} \;\; b_n < t, \tag{5.15}$$

which implies that (5.11) specializes to

$$I_{2,k} \;=\; \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{b_1}^{b_n}\left|\oint_C \sum_{t<b_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}d\zeta\right| dt \quad \text{for} \quad k=1,2,\ldots. \tag{5.16}$$

From the properties of the functions $\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_n$ on the smooth curve C, it further follows that there exists a constant $M_2<\infty$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\left|\sum_{t<b_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta)+t\,\zeta}\right| \;\leq\; M_2 \quad \text{for all} \quad \zeta\in C \quad \text{and} \quad b_1\leq t\leq b_n, \tag{5.17}$$

from which we deduce that

$$I_{2,k} \;\leq\; M_2\,(b_n-b_1)\;\text{length}(C) \quad \text{for all} \quad k=1,2,\ldots \tag{5.18}$$

After these preparations we conclude from (5.10), (5.11), (5.12), (5.14), and (5.18) that

$$\int_0^\infty |L_{t,k}(f)|\,dt \;\leq\; M_0\left[M_1\sum_{j=1}^n e^{a_{jj}} + M_2\,(b_n-b_1)\;\text{length}(C)\right] =: M \tag{5.19}$$

for all $k=1,2,\ldots$, and consequently by Theorem 3 it is proven that there exists a measure $\mu_{A,B}$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ of bounded variation that satisfies (1.2). We have $\|\mu_{A,B}\|\leq M$. □

5.3. Proof of the Formulae (1.12) through (1.14).

In the present subsection we shall prove the representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$. Because of Assumption 1 in Section 2 we can take

$$\widetilde{b}_j=b_j \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{a}_{jj}=a_{jj} \quad \text{for} \quad j=1,\ldots,n \tag{5.20}$$

in (1.12) through (1.14).

In a first step we use Theorem 4 for getting an asymptotic representation for the distribution function $\mu_{A,B}\left([0,t]\right)$, $t\in\mathbb{R}_+$. From Proposition 5 we know that we can assume $\mu_{A,B}$ to be of bounded variation. Theorem 4 is therefore applicable, and it yields that

$$\mu_{A,B}\left([0,t]\right) \;=\; \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_0^t L_{u,k}(f)du \tag{5.21}$$

for each $t>0$ with $\mu_{A,B}\left(\{t\}\right)=0$. Further, it follows from Theorem 4 that

$$\mu_{A,B}\left(\{0\}\right) = \lim_{t\to\infty} f(t). \tag{5.22}$$

In (5.21) and (5.22), f is the function from (1.1). From Assumption 2 in Section 2 together with (3.30) in Lemma 9 and (3.6) in Lemma 6 of Section 3, we deduce that

$$\mu_{A,B}\left(\{0\}\right) = \lim_{t\to\infty} f(t) \;=\; \lim_{t\to\infty}\sum_{j=1}^n e^{\lambda_j(t)} \;=\; 0. \tag{5.23}$$

In the next three subsections we shall exploit relation (5.21) and (5.23). In the first one we shall consider the discrete part of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$, then we shall show that $\mu_{A,B}|_{[0,b_1)\cup(b_n,\infty)}=0$, and in the last subsection, we shall verify the formulae (1.13) and (1.14) in Theorem 2.

5.3.1. *The Discrete Part of the Measure* $\mu_{A,B}$. We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 23. *The discrete part* μ_d *of the measure* $\mu_{A,B}$ *is given by*

$$\mu_d = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_{jj}} d\delta_{b_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\widetilde{a}_{jj}} d\delta_{\widetilde{b}_j} \tag{5.24}$$

with δ_x *denoting the Dirac measure at* x.

Remark 7. *The second equality in (5.24) is a consequence of (5.20), i.e., of of Assumption 1 in Section 2.*

Proof. The proof of (5.24) follows rather immediately from Proposition 4 together with the Corollaries 1, 2, and 3 to Proposition 2 in Section 4.

Combining Proposition 4 with Corollary 1 yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{A,B}(\{b_j\}) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} (-1)^k (\frac{e}{b_j})^k f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{b_j}) \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} (-1)^k (\frac{e}{b_j})^k (-1)^k (\frac{b_j}{e})^k e^{a_{jj}} = e^{a_{jj}} \end{aligned}\tag{5.25}$$

for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

On the other hand, we deduce from Corollary 2 and 3 that for each $t \in (0,\infty)\diagdown\{b_1,\dots,b_n\}$ we have

$$f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \mathrm{O}(1) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty. \tag{5.26}$$

Indeed, for $t \in [b_1, b_n]\diagdown\{b_1,\dots,b_n\}$, estimate (5.26) follows from Corollary 2 combined with estimate (5.17). In order to prove (5.26) for $t \in (0, b_1) \cup (b_n, \infty)$, we first deduce from (4.2) that we have

$$\mathrm{O}\left(\sqrt{k}\,\psi(\frac{b_1}{t})^{k-1}\right) = \mathrm{O}\left(\sqrt{k}\,\psi(\frac{b_1}{t})^{k}\right) = o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty,$$

which then proves (5.26) for $t \in (0, b_1) \cup (b_n, \infty)$ by (4.6) in Corollary 3.

From Proposition 4 together with (5.23) it follows that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+\diagdown\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{A,B}(\{t\}) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} (\frac{e}{t})^k f^{(k)}(\frac{k}{t}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} (\frac{e}{t})^k k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \mathrm{O}(1) \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} k! \left(\frac{e}{k}\right)^k \frac{t}{k}\,\mathrm{O}(1) = 0,\end{aligned}\tag{5.27}$$

where the last equality is a consequence of Sterling's formula $k! = k^k e^{-k}\sqrt{k\,2\pi}\,(1+\mathrm{O}(k^{-1}))$ as $k\to\infty$. Putting (5.25) and (5.27) together yields that

$$\mu_{A,B}(\{t\}) = \begin{cases} e^{a_{jj}} & \text{for} \quad t = b_j,\ j = 1,\dots,n \\ 0 & \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+\diagdown\{b_1,\dots,b_n\}, \end{cases}\tag{5.28}$$

which verifies (5.24). □

5.3.2. *The Measure $\mu_{A,B}$ outside of* $[b_1, b_n]$. In the present subsection we prove the following lemma about the support of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$.

Lemma 24. *We have*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{A,B}) \subseteq [b_1, b_n] = \left[\widetilde{b}_1, \widetilde{b}_n\right]. \tag{5.29}$$

Proof. Let $[t_1, t_2]$ be an arbitrary subinterval of $[0, b_1)$. Because of Lemma 23 we can deduce from Theorem 4 and Corollary 3 to Proposition 2 together with (5.1) in Definition 5 that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{A,B}([t_1, t_2]) &= (1 + \mathrm{o}(1)) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L_{t,k}(f) dt \\ &= \mathrm{O}(k^{1/2}) \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \psi(\frac{b_1}{t})^{k-1} dt \\ &= \mathrm{O}\left(k^{1/2}\right) \psi(\frac{b_1}{t_2})^{k-1} = \mathrm{o}(1) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

Indeed, the first equality follows from (5.4) in Theorem 4. Notice that from (5.24) in Lemma 23 we know that $\mu_{A,B}(\{t_1\}) = \mu_{A,B}(\{t_2\}) = 0$. The second inequality in (5.30) follows from the first line of (4.6) in Corollary 3 together with (5.1). Since the error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{1/2}\psi(b_1/t)^{k-1})$ in (4.6) holds uniformly for $t \in (0, b_1)$, it is possible to move $\mathrm{O}(k^{1/2})$ out of the integral in the second line of (5.30), and the third equality in (5.30) follows from the monotonicity of the function ψ in $(0, 1)$ (cf., (4.2)). The last equality is a consequence of $\psi(b_1/t_2) < 1$, which has been shown in (4.2).

From (5.30) we deduce that $\mu_{A,B}([t_1, t_2]) = 0$, and since $[t_1, t_2]$ was an arbitrary subinterval of $[0, b_1)$, this implies that

$$\mu_{A,B}|_{[0,b_1)} = 0. \tag{5.31}$$

The complementary identity $\mu_{A,B}|_{(b_n,\infty)} = 0$ can be proved in exactly the same way as (5.31), only that in Corollary 3 we have to use the second line of (4.6) instead of the first one, and in (4.2) we observe that the function ψ is also monotonic and smaller than 1 in the interval $(1, \infty)$. Both identities together prove (5.29). The equality in (5.29) is a consequence of (5.20). □

5.3.3. *The Density Function $w_{A,B}$.* We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 25. *The difference $\mu_{A,B} - \mu_d$ is an absolutely continuous measure, where μ_d is the discrete component of $\mu_{A,B}$ as stated in (5.24). For the density function $w_{A,B}$ of $\mu_{A,B} - \mu_d$ we have the representations*

$$w_{A,B}(t) = -\sum_{b_j > t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \tag{5.32}$$

and

$$w_{A,B}(t) = \sum_{b_j < t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \tag{5.33}$$

for $t \in [b_1, b_n]$. In (5.32) and (5.33) the objects C_j and λ_j are same as in Theorem 2 or in Proposition 2. The function $w_{A,B}$ is continues in $[b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$, and bounded in $[b_1, b_n]$.

Remark 8. *The assertions of Lemma 25 are the main contribution to the proof of Theorem 2,* Proof. It follows from Lemma 15 that the two representations (5.32) and (5.33) are identical for each $t \in [b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, and it also follows from this lemma that both functions are identical zero for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus [b_1, b_n]$.

Let now the function w be define by

$$w(t) := -\sum_{b_j > t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \tag{5.34}$$

with C_j and λ_j the same objects as in (5.32). We will prove that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} L_{t,k}(f) = w(t) \quad \text{locally uniformly for} \quad t \in [b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}. \tag{5.35}$$

Indeed, it follows from the first line of (4.5) in Corollary 2 to Proposition 2 together with (5.1) in Definition 5 and (5.34) that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{t,k}(f) &= \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \left(\frac{k}{t}\right)^{k+1} (-1)^k k! \left(\frac{t}{k}\right)^{k+1} \left(1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) w(t) \\ &= \left(1 + \mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})\right) w(t) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

Since the error term $\mathrm{O}(k^{-1/4})$ in (4.5) of Corollary 2 holds uniformly on compact subsets of $[b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, the convergence in (5.35) is locally uniform.

Since the functions λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, are independent of t, the continuity of the function w in $[b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ is immediate, and from (5.17) it also follows that w is bounded on $[b_1, b_n]$.

From (5.21) and the locally uniform convergence (5.35) it follows that the distribution function $F_{A,B}(t) := \mu_{A,B}([0,t])$ is continuously differentiable for each $t \in [b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, and the derivative is given by

$$F'_{A,B}(t) = w(t) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}. \tag{5.37}$$

From (5.37) together with (5.34) we deduce (5.32), and (5.33) then follows from the remark we had made just at the beginning of the proof. □

For a verification of the representations (5.32) and (5.33) we could also have used Proposition 3. However, in Lemma 25 we have also proved the absence of a singular component in the measure $\mu_{A,B}$, and for this purpose we have needed the more general assertions of Theorem 4.

5.4. Conclusion for the Proof of Theorem 1 and 2.

With Proposition 5 we have settled the existence question for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in Theorem 1, however, the question of positivity of $\mu_{A,B}$ is still open. With the Lemmas 23, 24, and 25, all assertions in Theorem 2 have been proved except for the positivity assertion. While the positivity of the discrete component of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ is obvious from representation (1.12), it remains to show that the density function $w_{A,B}$ is non-negative.

6. Proof of Positivity

In the present section we shall prove that the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ is positive. The essential problem is here to show that the density function $w_{A,B}$ in (1.13) and (1.14) of Theorem 2 is non-negative in $[b_1, b_n] \setminus \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. Together with the results from the last section this will then complete the proof of Theorem 1 and 2.

6.1. A Preliminary Assumption.

In a first version of the proof of positivity we make the following additional assumption, which will afterwards in Subsection 6.4 be shown to be superfluous.

Assumption 3. *The polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ in equation (3.1), which is identical with the polynomial in (1.10), is assumed to be irreducible.*

As a consequence of the irreducibility several definitions from Section 3 possess now specific properties. We list them together with some additional notions and definitions:

(i) The solution λ of equation *(3.1)* is an algebraic function of degree n (cf., Subsection 3.1).

(ii) The covering manifold $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ from Subsection 3.2 is now a compact Riemann surface with n sheets over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Like before, by $\pi_\lambda : \mathcal{R}_\lambda \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ we denote its canonical projection.

(iii) The n functions λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, from Definition 2 in Subsection 3.2 are n branches of the algebraic function λ.

(iv) By C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, we denote n Jordan curves that are all identical with a single curve $C \subset \mathbb{C}$, and this curve is assumed to be smooth, positively oriented, and chosen in such a way that each function λ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, is analytic on and outside of C.

(v) By ϱ we denote the lifting of the complex conjugation from $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ onto $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, and call it reflection function, i.e., ϱ is a continuous mapping from $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ onto $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ with $\pi_\lambda(\varrho(\zeta)) = \overline{\pi_\lambda(\zeta)}$ for all $\zeta \in \mathcal{R}_\lambda$. By $\mathcal{R}_+ \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$ we denote the subsurface $\mathcal{R}_+ := \{\, z \in \mathcal{R}_\lambda \mid \operatorname{Im} \pi_\lambda(z) > 0 \,\}$, and by $\mathcal{R}_- \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$ the corresponding subsurface defined over base points with a negative imaginary part.

6.2. The Main Proposition.

The proof of positivity under Assumption 3 is based on assertions that are formulated and proved in the next proposition.

Proposition 6. *Under Assumption 3 for any $t \in (b_I, b_{I+1})$ with $I \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ there exists a chain γ of finitely many closed integration paths on the Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ such that*

$$\operatorname{Im} e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} = 0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad \zeta \in \gamma, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} d\zeta < 0, \tag{6.2}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} d\zeta = -\sum_{j=1}^{I} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(z) + t\,z} dz, \tag{6.3}$$

and as a consequence of (6.2) and (6.3) we have

$$\sum_{b_j < t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(z) + t\,z} dz > 0. \tag{6.4}$$

In (6.1) through (6.4) the objects π_λ, λ, λ_j, C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, I$, possess properties that have been listed in (ii), (i), (iii) and (iv) in the last subsection.

The proof of Proposition 6 will be given after a preparation by two lemmas and several technical definitions. Throughout the subsection the numbers $t \in (b_I, b_{I+1})$ and $I \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ are kept fixed, and Assumption 3 is taken to be effective.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} D_\pm &:= \{\, \zeta \in \mathcal{R}_\lambda \mid \pm \operatorname{Im}(\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) > 0, \ \pm \operatorname{Im}(\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) > 0 \,\}, \\ D &:= \operatorname{Int}\left(\overline{D_+ \cup D_-}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

The set $D \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$ is open, but not necessarily connected. Since the algebraic function λ is of real-type, we have $\varrho(D_\pm) = D_\mp$ with the reflection function ϱ from (v) in the last subsection. Further, we have $D_\pm \subset \mathcal{R}_\pm$ with $\mathcal{R}_\pm$ defined in (v) in the last subsection.

By $Cr \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$ we denote the set of critical points of the function $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda + t\,\pi_\lambda)$, which is at the same time also the set of critical points of $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda + t\,\pi_\lambda)$, and the set of zeros of the derivative $(\lambda + t\,\pi_\lambda)'$. Since $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ is compact, it follows that Cr is finite.

Lemma 26. *(i) The boundary $\partial D \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$ consists of a chain*

$$\gamma = \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_K \tag{6.6}$$

of K piece-wise analytic Jordan curves γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. The orientation of each γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, is such that the domain D lies to its left. The curves γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, are not necessarily disjoint, however, intersections are possible only at critical points $\zeta \in Cr$.

(ii) Each Jordan curve γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, is invariant under the reflection function ϱ except for its orientation, i.e., we have $\varrho(\gamma_k) = -\gamma_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$.

(iii) Let $2s_k$ be the length of the Jordan curve γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. With a parameterization by arc length we then have

$$\gamma_k : [0, 2s_k] \longrightarrow \partial D \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda.$$

The starting point of each γ_k can always be chosen in such a way that

$$\gamma_k((0, s_k)) \subset \partial D_+ \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_k((s_k, 2s_k)) \subset \partial D_- \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{6.7}$$

(iv) The function $\mathrm{Re}\,(\lambda \circ \gamma_k + t\,(\pi_\lambda \circ \gamma_k))$ is monotonically increasing on $(0, s_k)$, monotonically decreasing on $(s_k, 2s_k)$, and these monotonicities are strict at each $\zeta \in \gamma_k \diagdown (Cr \cup \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbb{R}))$.

Proof. The function $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda + t\,\pi_\lambda)$ is harmonic in $\mathcal{R}_\lambda \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\{\infty\})$. As a system of level lines of an harmonic function, ∂D consists of piece-wise analytic arcs, their orientation can be chosen in such a way that the domain D lies to the left of ∂D. Since $\partial D \diagdown Cr$ consists of analytic arcs, each $\zeta \in \partial D \diagdown Cr$ locally touches only two components of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda \diagdown Cr$, and locally it belongs only to one single Jordan subarc of $\partial D \diagdown Cr$. Globally, for each $\zeta \in \partial D$ there exists a Jordan curve $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in ∂D with $\zeta \in \widetilde{\gamma}$, but this association is in general not unique. By successive exhaustions, it follows that ∂D is the union of Jordan curves. These curves may intersect, but because of the Implicit Function Theorem, intersections are possible only at points in Cr.

It remains to show that the number of Jordan curves in ∂D is finite. Indeed, because of the harmonicity of $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda + t\,\pi_\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{R}_\lambda \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\{\infty\})$, none of these curves can be null-homotop in $\mathcal{R}_\lambda \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\{\infty\})$, and by the same reason, two different Jordan curves can also not be homotop in $\mathcal{R}_\lambda \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\{\infty\})$. Consequently, it follows from the compactness of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$ that the total number of curves is finite. With this last statement we have completed the proof of assertion (i).

Since λ is a function of real-type, we deduce by the reflection function ϱ that

$$(\lambda \circ \varrho)(\zeta) + t\,(\pi_\lambda \circ \varrho)(\zeta) = \overline{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta \in \mathcal{R}_\lambda,$$

and therefore also that

$$\varrho(\partial D) = \partial D, \tag{6.8}$$

which implies that we can select the Jordan curves γ_k in (6.6) in such a way that we have $\varrho(\gamma_k) = -\gamma_k$ for each $k = 1, \ldots, K$, which proves assertion (ii).

With a parameterization by arc length, each γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, is a mapping of $[0, 2s_k]$ into ∂D. From (6.8) and the fact that γ_k is a Jordan curve, we deduce that $\gamma_k \cap \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbb{R})$ consists of exactly two points. If we choose the appropriate one as starting point, then (6.7) is satisfied.

The monotonicity statements in assertion (iv) are a consequence of the Cauchy-Riemann differential equations applied to the function $\lambda + t\,\pi_\lambda$ and the particular choice of orientation in each of the curves γ_k, $k = 1, \ldots, K$. Indeed, the fact that D is assumed to lie to the left of γ_k implies by (6.5) that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial n} \operatorname{Im}(\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) \;>\; 0 \quad \text{for each} \quad \zeta \in \gamma_k \cap (\mathcal{R}_+ \diagdown Cr), \tag{6.9}$$

and consequently we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \operatorname{Re}(\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) \;>\; 0 \quad \text{for each} \quad \zeta \in \gamma_k \cap (\mathcal{R}_+ \diagdown Cr) \tag{6.10}$$

by the Cauchy-Riemann differential equations differential equations. In (6.9), $\partial/\partial n$ denotes the normal derivative on γ_k showing into D, and in (6.10), $\partial/\partial t$ denotes the tangential derivative. In $\mathcal{R}_-$, we get the corresponding inequality

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \operatorname{Re}(\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) \;<\; 0 \quad \text{for each} \quad \zeta \in \gamma_k \cap (\mathcal{R}_- \diagdown Cr). \tag{6.11}$$

From (6.10) and (6.11) together with (6.7) we deduce the monotonicity statements in (iv), which completes the proof of Lemma 26. ☐

Lemma 27. *We have*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma_k} e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} d\zeta \;<\; 0 \quad \textit{for each} \quad k = 1, \ldots, K. \tag{6.12}$$

Proof. We abbreviated the integrand in (6.12) by

$$g(\zeta) := e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\zeta}, \quad \zeta \in \mathcal{R}_\lambda \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\{\infty\})$$

and assume $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ to be fixed in (6.12).

From assertion (i) in Lemma 26 we know that $\operatorname{Im} g(\zeta) = 0$ for all $\zeta \in \gamma_k$, and from assertion (iv) that $\operatorname{Re} g(\zeta) = g(\zeta)$ is strictly increasing on $\gamma_k \cap (\mathcal{R}_+ \diagdown Cr)$. From the proof of this last assertion it is evident that also the following slightly stronger assertion

$$(g \circ \gamma_k)'(s) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < s < s_k \ \text{ and } \ \gamma_k(s) \notin Cr \tag{6.13}$$

holds true. From (6.7) in assertion (ii) of Lemma 26 we know that $\gamma_k \cap \mathcal{R}_+$ is the subarc $\gamma_k|_{(0,s_k)}$. It further follows from (6.7) that we have

$$\operatorname{Im} \gamma_k(0) = \operatorname{Im} \gamma_k(s_k) = 0 \ \text{ and } \ \operatorname{Im} \gamma_k(s) > 0 \ \text{ for } \ 0 < s < s_k. \tag{6.14}$$

Let the coordinates $\zeta = \xi + i\,\eta$ and the differentials $d\zeta = d\xi + i\,d\eta$ be lifted from $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ onto $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$. Taking into consideration that $\varrho(\gamma_k) = -\gamma_k$, $\varrho(d\zeta) = \overline{d\zeta}$, and $(g \circ \varrho)(\zeta) = \overline{g(\zeta)} = g(\zeta)$ for all $\zeta \in \gamma_k$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma_k} g(\zeta) d\zeta &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k \cap \overline{D}_+} \cdots + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_k \cap \overline{D}_-} g(\zeta)\,(d\xi + i\,d\eta) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_k \cap \overline{D}_+} g(\zeta) d\eta = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{s_k} (g \circ \gamma_k)(s) \operatorname{Im}(\gamma_k{}'(s))\,ds \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{s_k} (g \circ \gamma_k)'(s) \operatorname{Im}(\gamma_k(s))\,ds \;<\; 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Indeed, the first three equalities in (6.15) are a consequence of the specific symmetries and antisymmetries with respect to ϱ that have been listed just before (6.15), the last equality follows from partial integration together with the equalities in (6.7), and the inequality is a consequence of (6.13) and (6.14). □

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6. The chain γ of oriented Jordan curves (6.6) in Lemma 26 is the candidate for γ in Proposition 6. The equality in (6.1) and the inequality in (6.2) have been verified by Lemma 26 and 27, respectively. It remains to prove identity (6.3) and its consequence (6.4).

As integration paths C_j, $j = 1, \ldots, I$, in the integrals on the right-hand side of (6.3) we take the Jordan curves from assertion (iv) in the last subsection, and choose the curve C so close to infinity that we have

$$\operatorname{Im}(\lambda_j(z) + t\,z) \;>\; 0 \quad \text{for all} \;\; z \in C, \;\; j = 1, \ldots, I, \tag{6.16}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Im}(\lambda_j(z) + t\,z) \;<\; 0 \quad \text{for all} \;\; z \in C, \;\; j = I+1, \ldots, n. \tag{6.17}$$

Such a choice is possible because of (3.6) in Lemma 6 of Subsection 3.1 and the assumption $b_1 \le \ldots \le b_I < t < b_{I+1} \le \ldots \le b_n$.

Next we define

$$D_0 := D \diagdown \pi_\lambda^{-1}(\overline{\operatorname{Ext}(C)}) \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda. \tag{6.18}$$

From (6.16), (6.17), and (6.5) it follows that exactly I of the n components of $\pi_\lambda^{-1}(\overline{\operatorname{Ext}(C)})$ are contained in D. The complete set $\pi_\lambda^{-1}(\overline{\operatorname{Ext}(C)})$ consists of n separate components since all branch points of λ are contained in $\pi_\lambda^{-1}(\operatorname{Int}(C))$. Each of the n components $\widehat{C}_j \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, of $\pi_\lambda^{-1}(\overline{\operatorname{Ext}(C)})$ lies in a different sheet $S_\lambda^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, of the system of standard sheets introduced in Lemma 7 in Subsection 3.2. The enumeration of the sheets $S_\lambda^{(j)}$ corresponds to that of the functions λ_j as stated in (3.29). Let $\widetilde{C}_j \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, denote the lifting of the oriented Jordan curve $C \subset \mathbb{C}$ onto $S_\lambda^{(j)} \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda$. We then have $\pi_\lambda(\widetilde{C}_j) = C_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and from (3.29) it follows that

$$\lambda(\zeta) \;=\; \lambda_j(\pi_\lambda(\zeta)) \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta \in \widetilde{C}_j, \;\; j = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{6.19}$$

Since $\widetilde{C}_j = \partial \widehat{C}_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, the open set D_0 lies to the left of each $\widetilde{C}_j$. Together with assertion (i) of Lemma 26, it follows from (6.18) that the chain

$$\gamma + \widetilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{C}_I = \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_K + \widetilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{C}_I \subset \mathcal{R}_\lambda \tag{6.20}$$

forms the positively oriented contour ∂D_0 of D_0. By Cauchy's Theorem we then have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma + \widetilde{C}_1 + \cdots + \widetilde{C}_I} e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} d\zeta = 0. \tag{6.21}$$

The equality in (6.3) follows immediately from (6.21) and (6.19). The inequality in (6.4) is a consequence of (6.2) and (6.3) since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b_j \,<\, t} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta &= \sum_{j=1}^{I} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_j} e^{\lambda_j(\zeta) + t\,\zeta} d\zeta \\ &= \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} e^{\lambda(\zeta) + t\,\pi_\lambda(\zeta)} d\zeta \;>\; 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

□

6.3. A Preliminary Proof of Positivity. With Proposition 6 we are prepared for a proof of Theorem 1 and 2, which has a preliminary character since it requires Assumption 3 because of Proposition 6.

Proof of Theorem 1 and 2 under Assumption 3. The existence of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in Theorem 1 has been proved in Proposition 5 of Subsection 5.2. Its representation in (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 has been verified in the Lemmas 23, 24, and 25.

The positivity of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ follows by a combination of two arguments: From representation (1.12) in Theorem 2 it is obvious that the discrete part

$$d\mu_d = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{\widetilde{a}_{jj}} \delta_{\widetilde{b}_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{a_{jj}} \delta_{b_j} \tag{6.23}$$

of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ is positive.

As a second contribution it has been shown in (6.4) of Proposition 6 that the density function $w_{A,B}$ in (1.13) of Theorem 2 is positive on $\left[\widetilde{b}_1, \widetilde{b}_n\right] \diagdown \{\widetilde{b}_1, \dots, \widetilde{b}_n\} = [b_1, b_n] \diagdown \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. The validity of (1.13) in Theorem 2 has been proved in Lemma 25, and relation (1.15) in Theorem 2 has been proved by (5.29) in Lemma 24 in the last section.

In the present proof we have needed Assumption 3 since Proposition 6 would not hold true in its given form without this assumption. □

Actually, under Assumption 3, relation (1.15) in Theorem 2 can be proved in a slightly stronger form.

Lemma 28. *Under Assumption 3 we have*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\mu_{A,B}) = [b_1, b_n] = \left[\widetilde{b}_1, \widetilde{b}_n\right]. \tag{6.24}$$

Proof. The lemma is an immediate consequence of (6.4) in Proposition 6 together with the representations (1.12) and (1.13) in Theorem 2 and (5.29) in Lemma 24 in the last section. □

6.4. The General Case. In the present subsection we shall show that Assumption 3 is actually superfluous in the proof of Theorem 1 and 2. For this purpose we have to revisit some definitions and results from the Subsections 3.1 and 3.2.

If the polynomial $g(\lambda, t)$ in (3.1) is not irreducible, then it can be factorized, and we have $m > 1$ irreducible factor polynomials $g_{(l)}(\lambda, t)$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, of degree n_l in (3.1). For the partial degrees n_l we have $n_1 + \dots + n_m = n$. Each polynomial $g_{(l)}(\lambda, t)$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, can be normalized in accordance to (3.4).

The m polynomial equations (3.2) define m algebraic functions $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, and each of them has a Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda,l}$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, with n_l sheets over $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ as its natural domain of the definition. The solution λ of equation (3.1) consists of these m algebraic functions that have just been mentioned, and its domain of definition is the union (3.27) of the m Riemann surfaces $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda,l}$, $l = 1, \dots, m$.

Each algebraic function $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, possesses n_l branches $\lambda_{l,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_l$, which are assumed to be chosen in accordance to Definition 2, except for the new form of indices. As after (3.4), we again denote by $j : \{\, (l, i),\ i = 1, \dots, n_l,\ l = 1, \dots, m \,\} \longrightarrow \{\, 1, \dots, n \,\}$ the bijection that establishes a one-to-one correspondence between the two types of indices. We can assume that the correspondence has been chosen in such a way that

$$b_{j(l,1)} \leq \dots \leq b_{j(l,n_l)} \quad \text{for each} \quad l = 1, \dots, m \tag{6.25}$$

and that in (3.6) of Lemma 6 we have

$$\lambda_{j(l,i)}(t) \;=\; \lambda_{l,i}(t) \;=\; a_{j(l,i),j(l,i)} - b_{j(l,i)}t + \mathrm{O}\left(1/t\right) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty \tag{6.26}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n_l$, $l = 1, \dots, m$.

Oriented on (1.13) in Theorem 2 and (5.33) in Lemma 25, we define

$$w_{A,B,l}(t) \;:=\; \sum_{i=1,\ b_{j(l,i)}\,<\,t}^{n_l} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_{l,i}} e^{\lambda_{l,i}(\zeta)+t\,\zeta} d\zeta \quad l = 1, \dots, m, \tag{6.27}$$

where $C_{l,i} = C_{j(l,i)}$ denotes the same integration paths as in (5.33). From the new definition it follows that in (5.33) of Lemma 25 we have

$$w_{A,B}(t) \;=\; \sum_{l=1}^{m} w_{A,B,l}(t). \tag{6.28}$$

If Assertion 3 is satisfied, then the new definitions remain consistent in a trivial way with $m = 1$.

In the general proof of Theorem 1 and 2 the next proposition will take the role of Proposition 6; it is no longer demanded that Assumption 3 is satisfied.

Proposition 7. *(i) For each $l \in \{\,1, \dots, m\,\}$ with $n_l = 1$ we have*

$$w_{A,B,l}(t) \;=\; 0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \{b_{j(l,1)}\}. \tag{6.29}$$

(ii) For each $l \in \{\,1, \dots, m\,\}$ with $n_l > 1$ we have

$$w_{A,B,l}(t) \begin{cases} > 0 & \textit{for all} \quad t \in \left[b_{j(l,1)}, b_{j(l,n_l)}\right] \setminus \{b_{j(l,1)}, \dots, b_{j(l,n_l)}\} \\ = 0 & \textit{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \setminus \left[b_{j(l,1)}, b_{j(l,n_l)}\right]. \end{cases} \tag{6.30}$$

The functions $w_{A,B,l}$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, are bounded throughout $\mathbb{R}_+$.

Proof. The equality in (6.29) and in the second line of (6.30) follows from (6.27) and the analogue of Lemma 15 in Subsection 4.1, which can be proved for each complete set of branches $\lambda_{l,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_l$, of the algebraic function $\lambda_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, like Lemma 15 had been proved for the branches λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, of the function λ.

For the proof of the inequality in the first line of (6.30) we have to redo the analysis in the proofs of Lemma 26, 27, and Proposition 6, but now with the role of algebraic function λ, the Riemann surface $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, and the branches λ_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, taken over by $\lambda_{(l)}$, $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda,l}$, and $\lambda_{l,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_l$, respectively, for $l = 1, \dots, m$ with $n_l > 1$. It is not difficult to see that this transition is a one-to-one copying of all steps of the earlier analysis, and we will not go into details. Finally, we get the inequality in the first line of (6.30) as analog of (6.4) in Proposition 6.

Since the integration paths C_j, $j = 1, \dots, n$, in (6.27) can be chosen independently of $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, it follows that $w_{A,B,l}$ is bounded on $\mathbb{R}_+$. □

Finally, all pieces are together and we are ready for the general proof of Theorem 1 and 2, and thereby also for the proof of the BMV conjecture.

Proof of Theorem 1 and 2. The general proof of Theorem 1 and 2 is very similar to the preliminary one in the last subsection, only the role of Proposition 6 is now taken over by Proposition 7.

Again, the existence of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ in Theorem 1 follows from Proposition 5 of Subsection 5.2.

The representations (1.12) through (1.14) in Theorem 2 have been proved by the Lemmas 23, 24, and 25.

Only in the proof of positivity of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ there is some change. The positivity of the discrete part (6.23) of $\mu_{A,B}$ is again obvious from (1.12) in Theorem 2. But the proof of the non-negativity of the density function $w_{A,B}$ has now to be based on Proposition 7. From (6.28) together with Proposition 7 it follows that $w_{A,B}(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \left[\widetilde{b}_1, \widetilde{b}_n\right] \diagdown \{\widetilde{b}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{b}_n\} = [b_1, b_n] \diagdown \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$, which completes the proof of positivity of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$.

Relation (1.15) in Theorem 2 again follows from (5.29) in Lemma 24, but now we can no longer prove (6.28) since it can not be excluded that in some intervals of $[b_1, b_n] \diagdown \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ all functions $w_{A,B,l}$, $l = 1, \ldots, m$, are identical zero. ☐

7. Proof of Proposition 1

The proof of Proposition 1 is given in two steps. In a first one, the formulae (1.5) and (1.6) will be verified. After that in Subsection 7.2, it will be shown that the density function $w_{A,B}(x)$ in (1.6) is positive for $b_1 < x < b_2$, which then completes the proof of Proposition 1. In the last subsection, representation (1.6) of the density function $w_{A,B}$ in Proposition 1 will be compared with a corresponding result in [**14**].

Formally, Proposition 1 is a special case of Theorem 2, and therefore not much new should be expected. However, representation (1.6) of the density function is much more explicit than the representations in Theorem 2, and therefore it needs a proof. We also give an independent proof for the positivity of this density function.

7.1. Proof of the Representations (1.5) and (1.6).

Representation (1.5) of the general structure of the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ follows as a special case from the analogous result (1.12) in Theorem 2. From (1.12) we further deduce that the density function $w_{A,B}$ can be represented as

$$w_{A,B}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_1} e^{\lambda_1(\zeta) + x\,\zeta} d\zeta \quad \text{for} \quad b_1 < x < b_2 \tag{7.1}$$

with λ_1 the branch of the algebraic function λ of degree 2 defined by the polynomial equation

$$\begin{aligned} g(\lambda, t) &= \det\left(\lambda\, I - (A - t\, B)\right) \\ &= (\lambda + b_1 t - a_{11})(\lambda + b_2 t - a_{22}) - |a_{12}|^2 = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

that satisfies

$$\lambda_1(t) = a_{11} - b_1 t \, + \, O(t^{-1}) \quad \text{as} \quad t \to \infty. \tag{7.3}$$

Further, the integration path C_1 in (7.1) is a positively oriented Jordan curve that contains all branch points of the function λ in its interior. From (7.2) and (7.3) it follows that λ_1 is explicitly given by

$$\lambda_1(t) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(a_{22} + a_{11}) - (b_2 + b_1)\, t + \sqrt{\left[(a_{11} - a_{22}) + (b_2 - b_1)\, t\right]^2 + 4\, |a_{12}|^2}\right] \tag{7.4}$$

with the sign of the square root in (7.4) chosen in such a way that $\sqrt{\cdots} \approx (b_2 - b_1)\, t$ for t near ∞. Evidently, λ_1 has the two branch points

$$t_{1,2} = \frac{a_{22} - a_{11}}{b_2 - b_1} \pm i\, \frac{2\,|a_{12}|}{b_2 - b_1}. \tag{7.5}$$

The main task in the present step of the proof is to transform the right-hand side of (7.1) into the more explicit expression in (1.6). In order to simplify the exponent in (7.1), we introduce a new variable v by the substitution

$$t(v) := \frac{a_{22} - a_{11}}{b_2 - b_1} + \frac{2}{b_2 - b_1}\, v, \quad v \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{7.6}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda_1\circ t)\,(v) &+ x\,t(v)\\ &= \frac{a_{11}(b_2-x)+a_{22}(x-b_1)}{b_2-b_1} + \frac{2\,x-(b_2+b_1)}{b_2-b_1}\,v \,+\, \sqrt{|a_{12}|^2+v^2} \\ &= \frac{a_{11}(b_2-x)+a_{22}(x-b_1)}{b_2-b_1} + g(v)\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

with

$$g(v) := \frac{2\,x-(b_2+b_1)}{b_2-b_1}\,v \,+\, \sqrt{|a_{12}|^2+v^2}. \tag{7.8}$$

Notice that if x moves between b_1 and b_2, then the first term in the second line of (7.7) moves between a_{11} and a_{22}, and the coefficient in front of v in the second term moves between -1 and 1. The assumption made after (7.4) with respect to the square root transforms into $\sqrt{|a_{12}|^2+v^2}\approx v$ for v near ∞. It is evident that g is analytic and single-valued throughout $\overline{\mathbb{C}}\diagdown[-i\,|a_{12}|,\, i\,|a_{12}|]$. From (7.7) and (7.1) we deduce the representation

$$w_{A,B}(x) = \frac{2}{b_2-b_1}\exp\left(\frac{a_{11}(b_2-x)+a_{22}(x-b_1)}{b_2-b_1}\right)\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_1} e^{g(v)}dv, \tag{7.9}$$

where again C_1 is a positively oriented Jordan curve, which now is contained in the ring domain $\mathbb{C}\diagdown[-i\,|a_{12}|,\, i\,|a_{12}|]$. Shrinking this curve to the interval $[-i\,|a_{12}|,\, i\,|a_{12}|]$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}w_{A,B}(x) \;=\; &\frac{1}{(b_2-b_1)\,\pi}\exp\left(\frac{a_{11}(b_2-x)+a_{22}(x-b_1)}{b_2-b_1}\right)\times \\ &\times\int_{-|a_{12}|}^{|a_{12}|}\exp\left(-i\,\frac{b_2+b_1-2\,x}{b_2-b_1}\,v\right)\left[e^{\sqrt{|a_{12}|^2-v^2}}-e^{-\sqrt{|a_{12}|^2-v^2}}\right]dv,\end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

and further that

$$\begin{aligned}w_{A,B}(x) \;=\; &\frac{4}{(b_2-b_1)\,\pi}\exp\left(\frac{a_{11}(b_2-x)+a_{22}(x-b_1)}{b_2-b_1}\right)\times \\ &\times\int_0^{|a_{12}|}\cos\left(\frac{b_2+b_1-2\,x}{b_2-b_1}\,v\right)\,\sinh\left(\sqrt{|a_{12}|^2-v^2}\right)dv,\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

which proves formula (1.6).

7.2. The Positivity of $w_{A,B}$. Since Proposition 1 is a special case of Theorem 2, and since the matrices A and B have been given in the special form of Assumption 3 in Subsection 6.1, the positivity of $w_{A,B}(x)$ for $b_1 < x < b_2$ has in principle already been proved by Proposition 6 in Section 6. However, the prominence of the positivity problem in the BMV conjecture may justify an ad hoc proof for the special case of dimension $n = 2$, which is simpler and possibly also more transparent than the general approach in Section 6.

From (7.1), (7.7), (7.8), and (7.9), it follows that we have only to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}I_0 \;:=\; &\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{C_1} e^{g(\zeta)}d\zeta \\ =\; &\frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^a \cos\,(b\,v)\,\sinh\left(\sqrt{a^2-v^2}\right)dv \;>\; 0\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

with the function g defined in (7.8), a and b abbreviations for

$$a := |a_{12}| \quad\text{and}\quad b := b(x) \;=\; \frac{2\,x-(b_2+b_1)}{b_2-b_1}, \quad\text{respectively,} \tag{7.13}$$

and C_1 a positively oriented integration path in the ring domain $\mathbb{C}\diagdown[-i\,a,\, i\,a]$.

Obviously, we have $-1 < b(x) < 1$ for $b_1 < x < b_2$. The value I_0 of the integral in the second line of (7.12) depends evenly on the parameter b, and I_0 is obviously positive for $b = 0$. Consequently, we can, without loss of generality, restrict our investigation to values of $x \in (b_1, b_2)$ that correspond to values $b \in (-1, 0)$, i.e., we have only to pay attention to $b_1 < x < (b_1 + b_2)/2$.

For a fixed value $x \in (b_1, (b_1 + b_2)/2)$ we now study the behavior of the function g from (7.8) in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-i\,a,\, i\,a]$. Because of the convention with respect to the sign of the square root in (7.8), we have

$$g(z) \approx (1+b)\, z \quad \text{for} \quad z \approx \infty. \tag{7.14}$$

The function $\operatorname{Im} g$ is continuous in $\mathbb{C}$, harmonic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-i\,a,\, i\,a]$, we have $\operatorname{Im} g(\overline{z}) = -\operatorname{Im} g(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$, and

$$\operatorname{Im} g(z) = b\, \operatorname{Im}(z) \begin{cases} < 0 & \text{for} \quad z \in (0,\, i\,a] \\ > 0 & \text{for} \quad z \in [-i\,a, 0). \end{cases} \tag{7.15}$$

From (7.14), (7.15), $1 + b > 0$, and the harmonicity of $\operatorname{Im} g$, we deduce that the set

$$\{\, z \mid \operatorname{Im} g(z) = 0 \,\} = \mathbb{R} \cup \gamma \tag{7.16}$$

implicitly defines an analytic Jordan curve γ, which is contained in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-i\,a,\, i\,a]$. We parameterize this curve by $\gamma : [0, 2\pi] \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ in such a way that it is positively oriented in $\mathbb{C}$ and that

$$\gamma|_{(0,\pi)} \subset \{\, \operatorname{Im}(z) > 0 \,\},\ \gamma(0) =: r_0 > 0, \text{ and } \gamma\,(2\pi - t) = \overline{\gamma\,(t)} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [0, \pi]\,. \tag{7.17}$$

From (7.16) it follows that g is real on γ. Further, we have

$$(g \circ \gamma)'\,(t) < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (0, \pi). \tag{7.18}$$

Indeed, if we set $D_+ := \operatorname{Ext}(\gamma) \cap \{\, \operatorname{Im}(z) > 0 \,\}$ and $D_- := \operatorname{Int}(\gamma) \cap \{\, \operatorname{Im}(z) > 0 \,\}$, then it follows from (7.14), $1 + b > 0$, (7.15), and (7.16) that

$$\operatorname{Im} g(z) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{for} \quad z \in D_+ \\ < 0 & \text{for} \quad z \in D_-, \end{cases}$$

and with the harmonicity of $\operatorname{Im} g$ we deduce that

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial n} \operatorname{Im} g\right) \circ \gamma\,(t) < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (0, \pi),$$

where $\partial/\partial n$ denotes the normal derivative on γ showing in the direction of D_-. The inequality in (7.18) then follows by the Cauchy-Riemann differential equations and the fact that $g \circ \gamma = \operatorname{Re} g \circ \gamma$.

With the Jordan curve γ and the inequality in (7.18) we are prepared to prove the positivity of the integral I_0 in (7.12). Using γ as integration path in the first integral in (7.12) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} I_0 &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{g \circ \gamma(t)} \gamma'\,(t)\, dt = \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Im} \int_0^{\pi} e^{g \circ \gamma(t)} \gamma'\,(t)\, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Im} \left[e^{g \circ \gamma(t)} \gamma\,(t) \right]_0^{\pi} - \frac{1}{\pi} \operatorname{Im} \int_0^{\pi} (g \circ \gamma)'\,(t)\, e^{g \circ \gamma(t)} \gamma\,(t)\, dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} (g \circ \gamma)'\,(t)\, e^{g \circ \gamma(t)} \operatorname{Im}(\gamma\,(t))\, dt > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

Indeed, the second equality in the first line of (7.19) is a consequence of the symmetry relations $(g \circ \gamma)\,(t) = (g \circ \gamma)\,(2\pi - t)$, $\gamma'\,(t) = -\overline{\gamma'\,(2\pi - t)}$, and $\gamma\,(t) = \overline{\gamma\,(2\pi - t)}$ for $t \in [0, 2\pi)$. The next equality follows from partial integration, and the last equality is a consequence of $\operatorname{Im} \gamma(0) = \operatorname{Im} \gamma\,(\pi) = 0$ and $\operatorname{Im}\,(g \circ \gamma)\,(t) = 0$

for $t \in [0, 2\pi)$. At last, the inequality in (7.19) is a consequence of (7.18) together with $\operatorname{Im} \gamma(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, \pi)$.

With (7.19) we have verified that $w_{A,B}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (b_1, b_2)$, which completes the proof of Proposition 1.

7.3. A Comparison with a Solution in [14]. In [**14**, Formulae (2.13) - (2.16)] an explicit representation for the measure $\mu_{A,B}$ has also been proved for the case of dimension $n = 2$. The representation for the density function $w_{A,B}$ in [**14**] differs considerably in its form from representation (1.6) in Proposition 1; it reads[1] as

$$\begin{aligned} w_{A,B}(x) \;&=\; \exp\left(\frac{a_{11}(b_2 - x) + a_{22}(x - b_1)}{b_2 - b_1}\right) G_{12}(x) \quad \text{with} && (7.20)\\ G_{12}(x) \;&=\; \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_{12}|^{2j}}{j!\,(j-1)!} \frac{(b_2 - x)^{n-1}(x - b_1)^{n-1}}{(b_2 - b_1)^{2n-1}}, \quad b_1 < x < b_2, && (7.21) \end{aligned}$$

if we use the terminology from Proposition 1. The representations (7.21) and (1.6) have not only a rather different look, they have also been obtained by very different approaches. However, they are identical, as will be shown in the next lines. We have to show that

$$G_{12}(x) = \frac{4}{(b_2 - b_1)\,\pi} \int_0^{|a_{12}|} \cos\left(\frac{b_2 + b_1 - 2\,x}{b_2 - b_1}\,u\right) \sinh\left(\sqrt{|a_{12}|^2 - u^2}\right) du \qquad (7.22)$$

for $b_1 < x < b_2$.

We use the same abbreviations a and b as in (7.13). From

$$\cos(b\,u)\,\sinh\left(\sqrt{a^2 - u^2}\right) \;=\; \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^j\, b^{2j}}{(2j)!\,(2k-1)!} \frac{u^{2j}(a^2 - u^2)^k}{\sqrt{a^2 - u^2}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^a \frac{u^{2j}(a^2 - u^2)^k}{\sqrt{a^2 - u^2}} du &= a^{2\,(j+k)} \frac{\Gamma(j + \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(k + \frac{1}{2})}{(j+k)!} \\ &= \pi\, a^{2(j+k)} \frac{(2j)!\,(2k)!}{2^{2(j+k)}\,(j+k)!\,j!\,k!} \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^a &\cos(b\,u)\,\sinh\left(\sqrt{a^2 - u^2}\right) du = \\ &= \pi \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^j\, b^{2j}\, a^{2\,(j+k)} \frac{4^{-(j+k)}}{(j+k)!\,j!\,(k-1)!} \\ &= \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a^{2n}}{4^n\, n!\,(n-1)!} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-1)^j \frac{(n-1)!}{j!\,(n-j-1)!} b^{2\,j} && (7.23)\\ &= \frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a^{2\,n}}{n!\,(n-1)!} \left(\frac{1 - b^2}{4}\right)^{n-1} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|a_{12}|^{2\,n}}{n!\,(n-1)!} \frac{(b_2 - x)^{n-1}(x - b_1)^{n-1}}{(b_2 - b_1)^{2(n-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

---

[1] Formula (2.15) of [**14**], which is here reproduced as (7.21), contains a misprint in the exponent of its denominator, erroneously there is written $2n + 1$ instead of $2n - 1$, but the correction can easily be verified by following the derivation starting from (2.11) in [**14**].

The last equality in (7.23) follows from

$$\frac{1}{4}(1-b^2)=\frac{1}{4}\left(1-\left(\frac{b_2+b_1-2\,x}{b_2-b_1}\right)^2\right)=\frac{(b_2-x)(x-b_1)}{(b_2-b_1)^2}.$$

With (7.23) identity (7.22) is proved.

References

[1] D. Bessis, P. Moussa, and M. Villani. Monotonic converging variational approximations to the functional integrals in quantum statistical mechanics. *J. Math. Phys.*, 16:2318–2325, 1975.

[2] Benoît Collins, Kenneth J. Dykema, and Francisco Torres-Ayala. Sum-of-squares results for polynomials related to the Bessis-Moussa-Villani conjecture. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 139(5):779–799, 2010.

[3] William F. Donoghue. *Monotone matrix functions and analytic continuation.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.

[4] Hershel M Farkas and Irwin Kra. *Riemann surfaces.* Springer-Verlag, 1980.

[5] Christian Fleischhack and Shmuel Friedland. Asymptotic positivity of Hurwitz product traces: two proofs. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 432(6):1363–1383, 2010.

[6] Frank Hansen. Trace functions as Laplace transforms. *J. Math. Phys.*, 47(4):043504, 11 p., 2006.

[7] Christopher J. Hillar. Advances on the Bessis-Moussa-Villani trace conjecture. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 426(1):130–142, 2007.

[8] Christopher J. Hillar and Charles R. Johnson. On the positivity of the coefficients of a certain polynomial defined by two positive definite matrices. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 118(3-4):781–789, 2005.

[9] Daniel Hägele. Proof of the cases $p \leq 7$ of the Lieb-Seiringer formulation of the Bessis-Moussa-Villani conjecture. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 127(6):1167–1171, 2007.

[10] Charles R. Johnson, Stefan Leichenauer, Peter McNamara, and Roberto Costas. Principal minor sums of $(A+tB)^m$. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 411:386–389, 2005.

[11] Igor Klep and Markus Schweighofer. Sums of Hermitian squares and the BMV conjecture. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 133(4):739–760, 2008.

[12] Peter S. Landweber and Eugene R. Speer. On D. Hägele's approach to the Bessis-Moussa-Villani conjecture. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 431(8):1317–1324, 2009.

[13] Elliott H. Lieb and Robert Seiringer. Equivalent forms of the Bessis-Moussa-Villani conjecture. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 115(1-2):185–190, 2004.

[14] M. L. Mehta and K. Kumar. On an integral representation of the function $Tr[exp(A-\lambda B)]$. *J. Phys. A*, 9:197–206, 1976.

[15] Pierre Moussa. On the representation of $\mathrm{Tr}(e^{(A-\lambda B)})$ as a Laplace transform. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 12(4):621–655, 2000.

[16] E. L. Post. Generalized differentiation. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 32:723–781, 1930.

[17] N. M. Temme. *Special functions: an introduction to the classical functions of mathematical physics.* John Wiley and Sons, 1996.

[18] David V. Widder. The inversion of the Laplace integral and the related moment problem. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 36:107–200, 1934.

[19] David V. Widder. *The Laplace transform.* Princeton University Press, 1946.

[20] Roderick Wong. *Asymptotic approximations of integrals.* Academic Press, 1989.

Current address: Beuth Hochschule/FB II; Luxemburger Str. 10; 13 353 Berlin; Germany
E-mail address: `HerbertStahl@aol.com`